Minutes of Meeting bid No. GEM/2023/B/4189229

S.No	Name of the Consultant	Existing Content of RFP	Queries raised by the bidder firm	Proposed amendment to the respective clauses of the RFP document
1.	M/s Mercados Energy Markets India Pvt. Ltd.	(i).(A). I. Technical Evaluation (Section :3) Specific experience of the consultants relevant to the assignment will be examined with emphasis on handling ARR (Tariff determination) related exercises of the Regulatory Commissions and utilities during the last 5 years	 Proposed Clause: Specific experience of the consultants relevant to the assignment will be examined with emphasis on handling ARR (Tariff determination) related exercises of the Regulatory Commissions and utilities during the last 5 7 years. Rationale: As per the scoring in the Technical evaluation criteria bidder has to furnish 40 MYT/ARR/APR Orders/Petitions for ERCs/Utilities to obtain full marks, so it is requested from JERC to increase the span of years in which bidder can show their experience incorporating such number of MYT/ARR/APR Orders/Petitions for ERCs/Utilities 	No Change
2.		(i).(A). I. Technical Evaluation (Section :3) The mark under this criterion shall be normalized with respect to maximum marks i.e., 40. The highest marks obtained by any bidder shall be set to 40 while marks of others have been computed proportionally with reference to the highest marks.	Proposed Clause: The mark under this criterion shall be normalized with respect to maximum marks i.e., 40. The highest marks obtained by any bidder shall be set to 40 while marks of others have been computed proportionally with reference to the highest marks. The marks under this criterion are subjected to a maximum of 40 Marks. Rationale: If the marks are to be distributed on pro-rata basis then it becomes very difficult for the bidder who has sufficient experience to compute and access own marks at the time of submission of the bid. In case of scoring criteria in any tendering process the marking to be allotted to any bidder must be precise and specific.	Clause shall stand replaced as under: - The marks under this criterion are subjected to a maximum of 40 Marks.
3		(iii).(A). I. Technical Evaluation (Section :3)(iii) Qualification and competency of the	Proposed Clause: (iii) Qualification and competency of the key professional staff, Qualifications Sub-criteria	No Change

		key professional staff, Qualifications	Marks for each degree for each individual 01		
		••	5		
		Sub-criteria	• B.Tech/B.E. Marks for each degree for each individual 01		
		• MBA/PGDM/M.Tech from IITs/IIMs	MBA/PGDM/MBE/M.Tech from other college /		
		Marks for each degree for each individual	university Marks for each degree for each individual 0.5		
		01	• MA/MCom/MSc/LLB/CA/CS/CFA/CMA.		
		• B.Tech/B.E. Marks for each degree for	Marks for each degree for each individual 0.5- 1		
		each individual 01	• BA/BCom/BSc/MSc/BCA/BBA Marks for each degree for		
		• MBA/PGDM/MBE/M.Tech from other	each individual 0.5		
		college / university Marks for each			
		degree for each individual 0.5	Rationale: Professionals from any specific institutes shall		
		• MA/MCom/MSc/LLB/CA/CS/CFA/CMA.	not be given higher weightage, rather the experience of		
		Marks for each degree for each individual	the individual in relevant field shall be considered for		
		0.5 1	awarding of higher marks. Including such criteria will give		
		• BA/BCom/BSc/MSc/BCA/BBA Marks for	advantage to a very few bidders making it as preferential		
		each degree for each individual 0.5	criteria, which should never form part of scoring criteria.		
			In fact, MBA (Power/Energy) courses are specialised MBA		
			courses from specialised power sector government		
			institutes such as National Power Training Institute, Apex		
			body of the Ministry of Power, Govt. of India and NTPC		
			Business School, the candidates of which gets way lower		
			score than IIT/IIM candidate. Also, degrees like		
			BA/BCom/BSc/BCA/BBA cannot be treated or given same		
			marks as compared to degrees like CA/CS, as they are		
			rather higher level of education degrees, requiring more		
			expertise and efforts to accomplish. Individual with CA/CS		
			degrees are expert in financial aspects, making them		
			critical part of Power Sector/Tariff related Consultancy		
			and should be awarded same marks as B.Tech/B.E or		
			MBA/PGDM/M.Tech. Since, Financial modelling is an		
			essential and a major part of the scope of work, Chartered		
			Accountants have specialised financial modelling skillsets		
			to enhance the quality and accuracy of the Tariff Order		
			deliverables.		
4	M/s Deloitte	(i).(A). I. Technical Evaluation (Section :3)	(i) Specific experience of the consultants relevant to	Clause shall stand replaced	as
	Touché	(i) Specific experience of the	the assignment will be examined with emphasis on	under: -	
	Tohmatsu	consultants relevant to the assignment	handling ARR (Tariff determination) related exercises of		
	. c.iniacou	concentants relevant to the assignment			

 India LLP	will be examined with emphasis on	the Regulatory Commissions and utilities during the last	(i) Specific experience of the
	handling ARR (Tariff determination)	5 years.	consultants relevant to the
		•	assignment will be examined
	related exercises of the Regulatory	The Construction of the Co	-
	Commissions and utilities during the last	assigned	with emphasis on handling ARR
	5 years.	MYT/ ARR/ 1 mark for	(Tariff determination) related
		APR Orders/ each tariff	exercises of the Regulatory
	Experience in Marks	Petitions petition/	Commissions and utilities
	assigned MYT/ ARR/ 1 mark for	for ERCs/ order Utilities	during the last 5 years.
	APR Orders/ each tariff	Other 0.50 mark	Experience in Marks
	Petitions petition/	Regulatory for each	assigned
	for ERCs/ order	ERCs/Utilities assignment/	MYT/ ARR/ 1 mark for APR Orders/ each tariff
	Utilities	matters for project	Petitions petition/
	Other 0.50 mark Regulatory for each		for ERCs/ order
	ERCs/Utilities assignment/	The mark under this criterion shall be normalized with	Utilities
	matters for project	respect to maximum marks i.e., 40. The highest marks	Other 0.50 mark Regulatory for each
		obtained by any bidder shall be set to 40 while marks of	Regulatory for each ERCs/Utilities assignment/
	The mark under this criterion shall be	others have been computed proportionally with reference	matters for project
	normalized with respect to maximum	to the highest marks.	<u></u>
	marks i.e., 40. The highest marks		The marks under this criterion
	obtained by any bidder shall be set to 40	Rational: The evaluation criteria already prescribes 1	are subjected to a maximum of
	while marks of others	marks for each petition/order and 0.5 marks for other	40 marks.
			40 marks.
	have been computed proportionally with		
	reference to the highest marks.	40 marks. Therefore, firm being able to meet the	
		maximum marks with the help of their credentials should	
		be provided the maximum marks instead of pro-rating the	
		same with respect to highest. It is submitted that firms	
		which have scored the maximum marks should be kept at	
		equal levels as compared with firms which have more	
		than 40 tariff petition/order as the same could be due to	
		several reasons such as multiple Discoms in the state or	
		large number of orders being handled by few ERCs such as	
		CERC. This prorating in turns gives undue advantage to the	
		specific firm while the other firms scoring maximum marks	
		are equally competent to undertake the assignment.	
		Therefore, it is submitted that firms being able to achieve	
		maximum marks based on the scoring methodology (1	

5	(iii) Qualificatio the key profess evaluated giving man-weeks com leader and other be actually workin sub criterion t evaluation of the be (a). Educationa	Evaluation (Section :3) (n and competency of sional staff will be due attention to the mitted by the team professionals, who will ng on the project. The o be followed for key professionals shall I Qualifications and (b).	marks for each petition/order and 0.5 marks for other assignments) should be allotted the same marks without any need for prorating. (iii) Qualification and competency of the key professional staff will be evaluated giving due attention to the man-weeks committed by the team leader and other professionals, who will be actually working on the project. The sub criterion to be followed for evaluation of the key professionals shall be (a). Educational Qualifications and (b). experience in carrying out similar assignment/jobs. In order to evaluate this aspect, the Committee shall evaluate the qualification, experience and total number of projects done by 5 no. of key personnel working with the firm as per submission in Form-2	Clause shall stand replaced as under: - (iii)Qualification and competency of the key professional staff will be evaluated giving due attention to the man-weeks committed by the team leader and other professionals, who will be actually working on the project.
	assignment/jobs. this aspect, the Co the qualification, number of project	experience and total experience and total is done by 5 no. of key g with the firm as per	The mark under this criterion shall be normalized with respect to maximum marks i.e., 35. The highest marks obtained by any bidder shall be set to 35 while marks of others have been computed proportionally with reference to the highest marks.	The sub criterion to be followed for evaluation of the key professionals shall be (a). Educational Qualifications and (b). experience in carrying out similar assignment/jobs. In order to evaluate this aspect, the
	The mark under normalized with marks i.e., 35. obtained by any bi while marks of	this criterion shall be respect to maximum The highest marks dder shall be set to 35 others have been ionally with reference	Rational: On similar lines as explained above, it is requested that the absolute value determined based on the criterias defined should be considered. Normalization with respect to the highest value further leads to creation of additional gap inspite of the fact that the proposed team personnel may have adequate experience and qualification to undertake the assignment.	Committee shall evaluate the qualification, experience and total number of projects done by 5 no. of key personnel working with the firm as per submission in Form-2 The marks under this criterion are subject to a maximum of 35 marks.
Reg	nt Electricity (b).(ii).(A). I. gulatory (Section :3) mmission	Technical Evaluation		Clause shall stand replaced as under: -

(b) Work plan – the bidder shall	(b) Work plan – the bidder
propose and justify the main activities	shall propose and justify the
of the assignment/job, their content	main activities of the
and duration, phasing and	assignment/job, their content
interrelations, milestones (including	and duration, phasing and
interim approvals by the Employer),	interrelations, milestones
and delivery dates of the reports. The	(including interim approvals
proposed work plan shall be	by the Employer), and
consistent with the technical approach	delivery dates of the reports.
and methodology, showing	The proposed work plan
understanding of the Terms of	should be consistent with the
Reference (TOR)/Scope of assignment	technical approach and
and ability to translate them into a	methodology, showing
feasible working plan. A list of the final	understanding of the Terms of
documents, including reports,	Reference (TOR)/Scope of
drawings, and tables to be delivered as	assignment and ability to
final output, shall be included here.	translate them into a feasible
The work plan shall be consistent with	working plan. A list of the final
the work schedule.	documents, including reports,
	drawings, and tables to be
	delivered as final output, shall
	be included here. The work
	plan shall be consistent with
	the work schedule.
	A maximum time period of 90
	days shall be allowed to the
	bidder for competition of work.
Noto : The Terms & Conditions and the Clauses of Pid. ed	

Note : The Terms & Conditions and the Clauses of Bid, other than mentioned above, shall remain unchanged.