

**Northern Ireland Authority for Utility Regulation (NIAUR) Technical and Financial Consultancy support for Northern Ireland Electricity (NIE) Transmission & Distribution (T&D) Price Control (RP5)**

OJEU Reference: 2010/S110-167235  
NIAUR Contract Reference: CON/03/10

**Questions & Answers – Set 5**  
**22 July 2010**

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE LAST DATE FOR OBTAINING SPECIFICATIONS WAS**  
**20 JULY 2010**

- Q1. With reference to Q1 of 'Q&A Set 3', a Tenderer asked if a subject to contract statement would be accepted by the Utility Regulator as part of a Tenderer's bid. The Tenderer asked at what stage such a statement would be evaluated.
- A1. The Utility Regulator re-emphasised that the standard terms and conditions in the framework document are not subject to change. If a subject to contract statement were included with a bid, it would be considered post-evaluation ie. If and after a Tenderer passes the selection and evaluation criteria which are outlined in the framework document. A subject to contract statement would not affect scores at the evaluation stage. The decision as to whether the Utility Regulator would accept or reject a subject to contract statement is dependent on it's content.
- Q2. A Tenderer noted that Page 19 of the ITT states that: "Considerable communication will be required between the winning consultant(s) and the Utility Regulator personnel. This needs to be a fundamental aspect of the assignment. To aid this, the project will be led by a project manager within the Utility Regulator." The Tenderer asked if, for the avoidance of doubt, this refers to a NIAUR project manager and that there is no requirement for Consultants to have personnel permanently based at NIAUR's premises.
- A2. The Utility Regulator confirmed that the reference to a project manager relates to a project manager in the Utility Regulator. A consultant would not need to have personnel permanently based at the Utility Regulator offices for the duration of the contract.

- Q3. A Tenderer asked for details of the Utility Regulator's video conferencing systems to ensure compatibility between systems. The Tenderer asked if the Utility Regulator has access to an ISDN line, or if the Utility Regulator's video conferencing system is based on IP transmission.
- A3. The Utility Regulator does have access to an ISDN line. The Utility Regulator's video conferencing systems can use IP addresses.
- Q4. A Tenderer stated that the pricing schedules on pages 42-44 of the ITT require information on consultant days or call off rate per hour for 12 key activities or call off specialisms. The Tenderer asked if these 12 key activities or call off specialisms refer to the 12 sub-lots.
- A4. The pricing schedule in part 5 of the framework document should be completed, with a copy also provided on MS Excel. The 12 lines of the pricing schedule do not relate to the number of sub-lots in the framework document. A separate pricing schedule should be completed for each sub-lot. These lines are for detailing any activities involved.
- Q5. A Tenderer stated that the worked example on pages 45-47 of the ITT shows the impact of a single uniform weighting of day rates for all three hypothetical firms across different consultant grades to calculate an average daily rate. The Tenderer asked for confirmation of whether these exact weights will be used by the Utility Regulator when assessing bids and whether bidders may propose alternative weights.
- A5. The worked example is for illustrative purposes only. Bidders may suggest alternative weightings for any particular sub-lot to the weightings outlined in the example.