

GUJARAT ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

6th Floor, GIFT ONE,
Road 5-C, Zone 5, GIFT CITY,
Dist.: Gandhinagar – 382 050, Gujarat, India.
Ph.: +91-79-2360 2000 | E-mail : gerc@gercin.org | Website : www.gercin.org

No.: GERC/Tariff/1457

Date: 30.07.2026

Subject : Engagement of Consultant to provide assistance to GERC in scrutiny, review, approval and monitoring Capital Investment Plan and related matters.

In response to queries raised by the participants on the RfP document for providing assistance to GERC in regulatory assignments on scrutiny, review, approval and monitoring Capital Investment Plan and related matters, the following amendments to the RfP document and clarifications are hereby issued.

- a. Sr. No. 6 and 9 of the table of Clause 5 - Eligibility and Qualification Criteria to the RfP is amended as follows:

Sr. No.	<i>Eligibility Criteria (to be met as on date of bid submission)</i>	<i>Supporting Documents Required</i>
6.	<i>The Bidder should have at least 60 full-time professionals on its payroll in India, out of which at least 40 should have experience in the power sector / infrastructure sector.</i>	<i>Declaration by the Authorised Signatory, along with a list of at least 60 full-time professionals on the Bidder's payroll in India, duly certified by the HR Department or the Authorised Signatory.</i>
9	<i>The Bidder, its leadership team and its personnel proposed to be deployed for this assignment should not have been blacklisted / debarred by regulator / Authority/ State Government Energy department/ MoP / MNRE in India in the past.</i>	<i>Undertaking by Authorised Signatory in prescribed form.</i>

- b. Form VI – Declaration / Certification (To be submitted on affidavit) is amended as follows:

FORM VI
Declaration / Certification (To be submitted on affidavit)

To,
The Secretary,
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission,
6th Floor, GIFT ONE, Road 5C, Zone 5, GIFT City,
Dist.: Gandhinagar,
Gujarat - 382050.

Sir,
I have carefully gone through the Terms & Conditions contained in the Request for Proposal document regarding the work of providing assistance to GERC in scrutiny, review, approval and monitoring Capital Investment Plan and related matters. I hereby declare and undertake that neither the firm nor the leadership nor any personnel proposed to be deployed for the purposes of this assignment are blacklisted / debarred for conducting studies or consultancy services by regulator / Authority/ State Government Energy department/ MoP / MNRE in India in past or present nor there is any pending dispute in this regard. I am an authorized signatory of my firm and therefore competent to make this declaration.

(Authorized Signatory)

(Name & Title of Signatory)

Name and Address of the Firm

- c. The Clause no. 11 - Last date of submission of RFP is amended as follows:

“ The final bids complete in all respects are required to be submitted latest by, on or before 14.08.2026, up to 1800 hours IST. ...”

The Commission's response to the queries of the interested bidders is given in the Annexure to this letter.

The interested bidders are advised to go through the clarifications given in the said Annexure. All other terms and conditions of the tender remain unchanged.

Sd/-
(Ranjeeth Kumar J., IAS)
Secretary
Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission

Place: GIFT City, Gandhinagar
Date: 30/07/2026

Encl. : As above.

Annexure

Bidder : Deloitte Touché Tohmatsu India LLP (DTTILLP)

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
1	General Query	-	It is requested to provide a rough estimate of the number of DPRs and cost of DPRs expected to be received from the Utilities for approval by the Commission during the project period and trend of DPRs received in the past 3 years. This shall help us in better budgeting of efforts for the engagement.	The number and value of DPRs likely to be submitted during the assignment cannot be predicted with certainty and will depend upon the proposals submitted by the regulated Utilities during the Control Period. The RfP does not guarantee any minimum or maximum quantity of work. The bidders shall quote the applicable unit rates (Per DPR) for Sr. No. B in Form V accordingly.
2	3. Scope of Work (Page 2)	ii. Analyze cost estimation methodology with reference to various documents from the Utility and/or otherwise available in public domain, including latest purchase orders, schedule of rates, cost data book / benchmark rates, supplier / contractor quotations, CPWD / State Schedule of Rates for civil works wherever	We understand that cost benchmarking shall be done based on GERC's Cost Data Book. Further we understand that preparation/ update of cost data book is not part of the scope of work of this engagement, as no separate payment/ milestone has been defined for the same.	Cost benchmarking shall not be restricted to any GERC Cost Data Book. The Consultant shall use the latest purchase orders, Utilities' Schedule of Rates/cost data books, benchmark rates, supplier or contractor quotations, CPWD/State Schedule of Rates and other reliable data specified in Clause 3(a)(ii). Preparation of a separate standalone Cost Data Book

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
		relevant, and reasonableness of unit rates.		is not envisaged as an independent deliverable. However, all benchmark data, rate analyses, working files and source documents developed or used during the assignment shall be maintained and submitted to the Commission in editable form. No separate payment shall be admissible. The clause stand clarified accordingly.
3	4. Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment (Page 3)	The consultancy services shall be for Capital Expenditure (Capex) Schemes submitted by Utilities under Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework mentioned under the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024 for the 4th control period from FY 2025-26 to FY 2029-30. The Commission may, at its discretion, extend the assignment for a further period or reduce / modify the scope based on requirement and performance of the Consultant.	Based on our experience of assisting clients on similar projects in the past, we understand that there can be significant spillover of projects beyond the control period. It is difficult to estimate the extent of such spillovers and cannot be priced in our bid accordingly. We request the Commission to define a fixed end date for the engagement, as the end of control period i.e. 31-Mar-2030. Any support required by the Commission beyond the end date of	The assignment pertains to the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period ending on 31.03.2030. Accordingly, all DPR Schemes, Non-DPR Schemes and TBCB Projects submitted during the said Control Period shall form part of the scope of this assignment. Submission related to DPR /Non-DPR/TBCB submitted after 31.03.2030 (New submissions) shall not be covered under this RfP, unless the period or scope of the assignment is specifically extended by the Commission on mutually agreed terms and conditions. However, in respect of any scheme or project assigned during the 4th Control

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			engagement, may be provided with suitable extension of the contract, at payment of a fixed man- month rate, till the closure of projects filled under Control Period FY26 to FY30. Commission may ask bidders to submit such man-month rates additionally as part of the financial bid, for evaluation.	Period, the Consultant shall provide assistance in accordance with the scope of work and the applicable milestones and deliverables specified in the RfP. Accordingly, it stands clarified.
4	Clause 4.1 Schedule of Work and Payments (Page No. 4)	Sr. No. 2(iv) Final Approval / Prudence Check / FAR Reconciliation .	Based on our experience of assisting clients on similar projects in the past, we understand that success of FAR reconciliation is not entirely in the hands of Consultant. While we shall assist the Commission in FAR reconciliation, we request to remove it from the payment milestones as it may lead to significant delay in payments.	As per Clause 5.7(e) of the Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework - GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024, FAR reconciliation is an integral part of the final approval and prudence-check process and shall remain a payment-linked deliverable. The timeline under Sr. No. 2(iv) commences only after the requisite information is provided by the Utility. The Consultant shall examine the records, carry out the reconciliation and identify any mismatch or deficiency. Payment shall be released after acceptance of the deliverable by the Commission. Accordingly, no change is required.

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
5	Clause 4.1 Schedule of Work and Payments (Page No. 5)	Sr. No. 3(ii) Final Verification and Integrity Report , including a "No-Artificial-Splitting" verification and detailed mapping of upstream/downstream dependencies for independent systems.	The scope mentions submission of a "Final Verification and Integrity Report." It is requested to clarify the intended scope and nature of the Integrity Report. We understand that engagement is advisory in nature and not audit. We as Consulting Firm can provide recommendation/ advice for the Client's perusal, and generally do not provide signed reports as we are not statutory auditors.	The Final Verification and Integrity Report is a consultancy deliverable and not a statutory audit report or an assurance certificate. It shall contain the Utility-wise assessment of Non-DPR Schemes, compliance with the applicable capping limit, verification regarding artificial splitting, mapping of the independent system and its associated upstream/downstream works, etc. as per the <i>Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework - GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024</i>. The clause stand clarified accordingly.
6	Clause 4.1 Schedule of Work and Payments (Page No. 5)	Sr. No. 4(ii) Continuous monitoring during execution till completion of the TBCB Project	We submit that the completion of TBCB projects may extend over several years and potentially exceed the designated control period. Given that TBCB projects in the transmission sector typically involve long-duration timelines of two to three years, they are inherently susceptible to spillovers that may result in completion beyond the control period.	The monitoring contemplated under Sr. No. 4(ii) includes continuous monitoring during execution till completion of the TBCB Project. Accordingly, any TBCB Project assigned during the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period shall be monitored until its completion in accordance with the scope of work and applicable milestones specified in the RfP, even where the project completion extends beyond the said Control Period.

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			Anyways the tariff of TBCB projects is determined through competitive bidding, irrespective of project construction period, delays, IDC calculation etc. Further these projects are implemented through separate SPVs for each project, simplifying their cost booking and accounting. Accordingly, this payment milestone may be removed.	The clause stand clarified accordingly and no change is required.
7	Clause 4.1 Schedule of Work and Payments (Page No. 5)	 The Commission may vary the milestone structure depending on actual flow of DPRs / petitions / schemes.	We humbly request to remove this para, as it leaves ambiguity in contract terms. Or it may be modified to say that the 'The Commission may vary the milestone structure, in mutual agreement with the Consultant, depending on actual flow of DPRs / petitions / schemes.'	The provision is intended to enable administrative realignment of the sequencing or timing of milestones depending upon the actual flow of DPRs/ petitions/schemes. Such realignment shall not alter the total quoted fee or the substantive scope of work. Any material alteration in the payment percentages, total consideration or substantive scope shall be made through a written amendment in consultation with the

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
				Consultant. The clause stand clarified accordingly.
8	Clause 5 Eligibility and Qualification Criteria (Page No. 6)	Sr. No. 10 The Bidder should not have any assignment with any regulated entity under the jurisdiction of GERC that creates conflict of interest with this assignment. The Bidder shall disclose all ongoing assignments with Gujarat utilities / licensees.	While we are currently not aware of any existing conflict of interest, considering the engagement is 4 years long and for 18 utilities in the state, it is possible that a conflict may arise in future. Also the work load may not be evenly distributed during the entire project duration and may come in bulk intermittently. Accordingly we propose that the Commission may empanel two (2) consulting agencies for this work, and allocate work among them on rotation basis. In case a Consultant has any potential conflict of interest in any project, that particular project may be allocated to the other Consultant. Also having two Consultants shall help in better management of intermittent work loads.	The RfP envisages selection of a single Consultant. The conflict-of-interest requirement is an essential and continuing obligation throughout the assignment. The Consultant shall avoid accepting any assignment that creates a conflict and shall immediately disclose any actual or potential conflict arising during the contract period. The proposal for empanelment of two agencies is not accepted. Accordingly, no change is required.

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
9	5.1. Team Composition (Page No. 7)	The team members / resource persons appointed by the Consultant shall report to the Commission or the officer(s) designated by the Commission.	We understand that entire team deployment shall not be required at Commission's office. A Project Manager/ SPOC can be deployed full time at Commission's office to coordinate the tasks, with other senior members travelling as per requirement. This will help us optimize the cost and also offer best senior resources for the work.	The entire team is not required to remain permanently stationed at the Commission's office. The Consultant shall designate a Project Director/ Manager and ensure the availability of all key resources throughout the assignment. The requirement and mode of interaction or deployment, including physical presence at the Commission's office and/or virtual interaction, shall be decided by the Commission from time to time based on the requirements/works of the assignment. No additional professional fee shall be payable. The clause stand clarified accordingly.
10	Form I RFP Letter Proforma (Page No. 13)	Sr. No. 2 Documents forming part of RFP: j) Certificates by a practicing Chartered Accountant, certifying the criteria given at under 5) Eligibility and Qualification Criteria of the RfP document.	We request you to kindly replace the word 'practicing CA' with 'qualified CA' from the mentioned clause. We humbly submit that organizations like ours have separate consulting and audit firms. While we, as consulting firm have qualified Chartered Accountant (CA) as part of the project	The requirement shall not be changed from a 'practising Chartered Accountant' to a 'qualified Chartered Accountant'. The certificates relating to turnover and net worth are independent certifications and shall be issued by a practising Chartered Accountant. Accordingly, no change is required.

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response						
			team, these team members are not practicing in audit of clients.							
11	4. Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment (Page 4)	Detailed technical, financial and regulatory scrutiny report including cost benchmarking, alternatives, CBA, risk analysis and proposed conditions.	We humbly submit that these detailed analysis are subject to availability and submission of data with utilities.	The detailed scrutiny shall be undertaken on the basis of complete information. Accordingly, the timeline under Sr. No. 2(ii) commences from receipt of complete information or replies. Accordingly, no change is required.						
12	Form V Financial Bid (Page No. 18)	<table><tr><td>Sr No.</td><td>Particulars</td><td>Basic</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>Capex Plan related support</td><td>Per DPR</td></tr></table>	Sr No.	Particulars	Basic	B	Capex Plan related support	Per DPR	Kindly clarify the methodology for financial evaluation under "Capex Plan related support." Will the financial evaluation be based on the sum of all per-DPR rates quoted by the bidders, or using some weightages for each type of DPR/ project.	For financial evaluation, the total financial quote shall be the aggregate of all amounts quoted under Parts A, B, C and D of Form V. However, actual payment shall be based on the quoted unit rate and the work actually assigned, completed and accepted by the Commission. The query stands clarified accordingly.
Sr No.	Particulars	Basic								
B	Capex Plan related support	Per DPR								
13	-	Pre-Bid Meeting: Not Available	We request the Commission to undertake an online pre- bid meeting. This would ensure all firms intend to	The queries received from the interested bidders are being clarified in writing. A separate pre-bid meeting is not						

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			participate in the tender in a more convenient manner.	considered necessary. Accordingly, no change is required.
14	3 a) i. (Page 2)	Assistance in reviewing proposals of major Capex Schemes , requiring issuance of 'In- Principle' approvals by GERC, w.r.t the need and objective of the proposed Scheme, economic, technical, safety and environmental aspects, consistency with the network/capacity growth and/or augmentation, efficiency/reliability/quality improvement, safety, replacement, plan, alternatives, funding sources, technical justification, cost-benefit analysis, risk analysis, alternatives and constraints, etc.;	It is requested to provide clarification w.r.t major capex scheme, does the Commission have defined any threshold limit (Rs. Lakh or Rs. Cr.) above which the scheme will be considered as Major.	The bidder is advised to refer to Clause 3.2 of Annexure III to the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024, wherein the applicable threshold limits for major capital investment schemes are specified. The query stands clarified accordingly.
15	3 a) v. (Page 2)	Assistance in final approval, prudence check, verification of completed cost, including time overruns, cost overruns and other related issues, capitalization, accounting treatment, FAR reconciliation and verifying	The clause indicates that the consultant needs to verify the Capitalization done by the Utility including physical verification of assets as per BoQ of the scheme along with verifying geo-tagging of each asset with the GIS	The scope primarily requires documentary, accounting and analytical verification and does not contemplate mandatory physical verification of every asset. The review shall include, as applicable, verification of actual cost and

Sr.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
		compliance of geo-tagging , etc. as per applicable Rules, Regulations, Commission's Orders, directions.	location shared by utility. Further, need clarification on the aspects to be covered under document verification as it will also cover verification of Purchase Orders, EIC verification, Road restoration or Municipality charges, cost overrun, time-overrun, decapitalization, etc. It is requested to provide clarifications, if yes, please allow Consultant to quote separately for physical & document verification.	quantities, purchase/work orders, invoices, delivery challans, completion reports, statutory clearances, time and cost overruns, capitalisation/de-capitalisation, asset put-to-use status, geo-tagging, FAR reconciliation etc. The Commission may direct sample-based site or physical verification wherever considered necessary. No separate professional fee shall be quoted for physical and documentary verification; the per-DPR rate shall include the professional effort under the scope. The query stand clarified accordingly.
16	Bid submission deadline	The last date for receiving proposal is 03.08.2026.	We request to provide at least 2 weeks time for bid submission, from the issuance of corrigendum, to allow us to get necessary internal clearances in place. The last date for receiving proposal may be extended till 17.08.2026.	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.

Bidder : Idam

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
1	Clause 4 (Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment - 4.1 - Schedule of Work and Payments (Sl. No. 2 - Capex Plan Approval, Review and Completion))	-	The RfP does not indicate the expected timeline within which the Commission would provide the DPRs, complete information replies or final directions. As the commencement of these activities is dependent upon such events, the overall timeline of the assignment cannot be ascertained. The RfP does not specify the duration for carrying out the activities envisaged under Sr. Nos. 2, 3, and 4 of the Scope of Work. We understand that the activities relating to CAPEX Framework and Scrutiny, Review & Approval of DPR Schemes and Non-DPR Schemes shall be undertaken in accordance with the Capital Expenditure Approval Framework to be developed by the Consultant under Sr. No. 1, in line with the Guidelines for Capital Expenditure	The assignment pertains to the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period ending on 31.03.2030. Accordingly, all DPR Schemes, Non-DPR Schemes and TBCB Projects submitted during the said Control Period shall form part of the scope of this assignment. Submission related to DPR /Non-DPR/TBCB submitted after 31.03.2030 (New submissions) shall not be covered under this RfP, unless the period or scope of the assignment is specifically extended by the Commission on mutually agreed terms and conditions. However, in respect of any scheme or project assigned during the 4th Control Period, the Consultant shall provide assistance in accordance with the scope of work and the applicable milestones and deliverables specified in the RfP. Accordingly, it stands clarified.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			Approval Framework stipulated under the GERC (Multi-Year Tariff) Regulations, 2024. Further, since the current MYT Control Period extends up to FY 2030, we understand that the Consultant shall be responsible for scrutinizing, reviewing, and facilitating the approval of DPR and Non-DPR schemes submitted by the utilities during the entire Control Period, in accordance with the approved CAPEX Framework. We request the Commission to kindly confirm whether our understanding is correct.	
2	Clause 4 (Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment - 4.1 - Schedule of Work and	Final Approval / Prudence Check / FAR Reconciliation	Request the Commission to remove the requirement relating to FAR Reconciliation from Milestone 2(iv), as the same is generally undertaken after capitalization of assets and falls outside	As per Clause 5.7(e) of the Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework - GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024, FAR reconciliation is an integral part of the final approval and prudence-check process and shall remain a payment-linked deliverable. The timeline

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
	Payments (Sl. No. 2(iv))		the scope of DPR scrutiny, review and approval under the present assignment.	under Sr. No. 2(iv) commences only after the requisite information is provided by the Utility. The Consultant shall examine the records, carry out the reconciliation and identify any mismatch or deficiency. Payment shall be released after acceptance of the deliverable by the Commission. Accordingly, no change is required.
3	Clause 4 (Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment - 4.1 - Schedule of Work and Payments 3(ii))	Final Verification and Integrity Report, including a "No-Artificial- Splitting" verification and detailed mapping of upstream/downstream dependencies for independent systems.	Request the Commission to clarify the methodology, process and evaluation criteria proposed for carrying out the detailed mapping of upstream/downstream dependencies for independent systems. Further, the term "Integrity Report" has not been defined in the RfP or Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework. Accordingly, the scope, contents and expected deliverables of the Integrity Report remain unclear. Request you to please clarify.	The Final Verification and Integrity Report is a consultancy deliverable and not a statutory audit report or an assurance certificate. It shall contain the Utility-wise assessment of Non-DPR Schemes, compliance with the applicable capping limit, verification regarding artificial splitting, mapping of the independent system and its associated upstream/downstream works, etc. as per the <i>Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework - GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024</i> . The clause stand clarified accordingly.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
4	Clause 4 (Timelines, Deliverables and Terms of Payment - 4.1 - Schedule of Work and Payments (4(ii)))	Continuous monitoring during execution till completion of the TBCB Project	Request the Commission to specify a definite timeline for completion of the monitoring activities under this milestone. Since the execution of TBCB Projects may take 3-4 years or can extend over 2--3 years or even beyond in case of project delays, linking the monitoring activities to the completion of the Project makes the scope of work open-ended. Accordingly, kindly specify the maximum duration or cut-off timeline up to which the Consultant shall be required to undertake such monitoring under the assignment.	The monitoring contemplated under Sr. No. 4(ii) includes continuous monitoring during execution till completion of the TBCB Project. Accordingly, any TBCB Project assigned during the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period shall be monitored until its completion in accordance with the scope of work and applicable milestones specified in the RfP, even where the project completion extends beyond the said Control Period. The clause stand clarified accordingly and no change is required.
5	Clause 5 (Eligibility and Qualification Criteria) – Sr. No. 6.	The Bidder should have at least 100 full-time professionals on its payroll in India, out of which at least 40 should have experience in the power sector / infrastructure sector. Declaration by Authorised Signatory and employee list certified by HR / authorised signatory.	Idam is a specialized management consulting firm with an exclusive focus on the power sector. We are committed to supporting climate change mitigation, promoting energy efficiency, facilitating the adoption of renewable energy, and advancing sustainable development through our consulting services.	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			As a niche consultancy dedicated solely to the power sector, we have a team of experienced professionals possessing extensive technical, regulatory, commercial, financial, and policy expertise. Our specialized domain knowledge enables us to effectively undertake and deliver complex assignments within the power sector. Considering the nature, scope, and level of effort envisaged under the present assignment, we believe that the requirement of having 100 full- time professionals is disproportionately high and may inadvertently restrict participation by competent and specialized consulting firms with proven sectoral expertise. In the interest of promoting wider competition and ensuring participation from qualified domain experts, we respectfully request the Authority to	

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			consider revising the Eligibility and Qualification Criteria as follows: <i>“The Bidder should have at least 65 full-time professionals on its payroll in India, out of which at least 50 should have experience in the power sector / infrastructure sector.”</i> Kindly consider dispensing with the requirement for submission of the employee list and instead accept a certification issued by the Authorized Signatory confirming compliance with the prescribed employee strength requirement, as the same would sufficiently establish the Bidder's eligibility under the RfP.	
6	5.1. Team Composition – Sr. No. 6 - Project Executives /Analysts	BE/B. Tech/B.S. with preferably M.Tech/ MBA/ PGDM with minimum 3 years of experience in power sector consultancy, regulatory analysis and functional application of modelling software/tools and data analysis for	Request the Authority to clarify the requirement for experience in the functional application of modelling software/tools for the proposed Project Executives/Analysts and specify the	No specific proprietary modelling software or tool is prescribed under the RfP. The requirement refers to practical experience in using suitable spreadsheet-based financial models, GIS based tools, database/MIS, data analytics, project-monitoring, cost-benefit, risk-analysis or

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
		regulatory, government and utility entities.	modelling software/tools envisaged to be used for execution of the assignment.	other analytical tools relevant to DPR scrutiny, cost benchmarking, Capex monitoring and regulatory analysis. The bidder may propose appropriate tools and methodology suited to the assignment. The clause stand clarified accordingly.
7	Clause 11 (Last date of submission of RFP)	The RfP specifies the proposal submission deadline as or before 03/08/2026 up to 1800 hours IST.	Considering the scope of the assignment and the time required for preparation of a comprehensive technical proposal, compilation of supporting documents and identification of suitable key resources, request the authority to kindly extend the proposal submission deadline by around 10- 15 working days to enable submission of a comprehensive proposal.	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.
8	Form – I: RFP Letter Proforma	j) Certificates by a practicing Chartered Accountant, certifying the criteria given at under 5) Eligibility and Qualification Criteria of the RfP document	We understand that, CA certificate is required only for Turnover & Net Worth criteria and not required for all the qualification criteria as mentioned under Clause 5 of the RfP. Please confirm.	The understanding is correct.

Bidder : PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
1	Clause 3(a):	Assistance in evaluating Capital Expenditure (Capex) Schemes... This will include... reviewing proposals of major Capex Schemes... inputs for preparing deficiency notes... project monitoring and quarterly and yearly progress review... final approval, prudence check, verification of completed cost... FAR reconciliation... progress review of Non-DPR Capex Schemes...	We understand that the DPRs pertaining to CAPEX schemes for which in-principal approval has already been granted, or is currently under process, if any, are excluded from the present scope of work. Kindly confirm our understanding. In the event that such DPRs are included within the scope, we request the Commission to kindly provide the relevant breakup and basis for fees applicable to any partial review. As in principal approval of the Capex scheme for a generating station/ units (including its expansion) involves significant effort. Hence, we understand that the scope of work excludes review of capex approval scheme of such nature. Kindly confirm whether our understanding is correct.	The assignment pertains to the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period ending on 31.03.2030. Accordingly, all DPR Schemes, Non-DPR Schemes and TBCB Projects submitted during the said Control Period shall form part of the scope of this assignment. Submission related to DPR /Non-DPR/TBCB submitted after 31.03.2030 (New submissions) shall not be covered under this RfP, unless the period or scope of the assignment is specifically extended by the Commission on mutually agreed terms and conditions. However, in respect of any scheme or project assigned during the 4th Control Period, the Consultant shall provide assistance in accordance with the scope of work and the applicable milestones and deliverables specified in the RfP. Accordingly, it stands clarified.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
2	Clause 3(a)(v): & Clause 4:	Clause 3(a)(v): Assistance in final approval, prudence check, verification of completed cost, including time overruns, cost overruns and other related issues, capitalization, accounting treatment, FAR reconciliation and verifying compliance of geo-tagging, etc. as per applicable Rules, Regulations, Commission's Orders, directions. Clause 4: The consultancy services shall be for Capital Expenditure (Capex) Schemes submitted by Utilities under Guidelines for Capital Expenditure Approval Framework mentioned under the GERC (MYT) Regulations, 2024 for the 4th control period from FY 2025-26 to FY 2029-30. The Commission may, at its discretion, extend the assignment for a further period or reduce / modify the scope	While the Schemes submitted within the 4th Control Period, i.e. FY 2025-26 to FY 2029-30 may be analysed and reviewed for prior-approval by the Commission, it is not clear on to how the Consultant will be able to extend its support on task mentioned in Clause 3(a)(v), which can be undertaken only on the completion of a Scheme. This may result in an open-ended tenure of the Assignment with no fixed end date. Accordingly, it is requested that the end date of the Assignment may either be fixed at the end of the 4th Control Period, or some fixed tenure (say 1 year) beyond the end of the 4th Control Period, and that too, for a limited purpose of providing support on the task mentioned in Clause 3(a)(v) of	The assignment pertains to the 4th GERC (MYT) Control Period ending on 31.03.2030. Accordingly, all DPR Schemes, Non-DPR Schemes and TBCB Projects submitted during the said Control Period shall form part of the scope of this assignment. Submission related to DPR /Non-DPR/TBCB submitted after 31.03.2030 (New submissions) shall not be covered under this RfP, unless the period or scope of the assignment is specifically extended by the Commission on mutually agreed terms and conditions. However, in respect of any scheme or project assigned during the 4th Control Period, the Consultant shall provide assistance in accordance with the scope of work and the applicable milestones and deliverables specified in the RfP. Accordingly, it stands clarified.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
		based on requirement and performance of the Consultant.	the ToR for Schemes submitted for approval within the 4 th Control Period.	
3	Clause 4 Note:	Percentages refer to the quoted fee for the respective task / DPR batch. Payment shall be released only after acceptance of deliverables by the Commission. The Commission may vary the milestone structure depending on actual flow of DPRs / petitions / schemes.	We request to drop the following sentence in the interest of certainty of the payment structure of the Assignment, which is crucial for deciding the Financial quote. <i>“.....The Commission may vary the milestone structure depending on actual flow of DPRs / petitions / schemes.”</i>	The provision is intended to enable administrative realignment of the sequencing or timing of milestones depending upon the actual flow of DPRs/ petitions/schemes. Such realignment shall not alter the total quoted fee or the substantive scope of work. Any material alteration in the payment percentages, total consideration or substantive scope shall be made through a written amendment in consultation with the Consultant. Accordingly, no change is required.
4	Clause 5, table S. No. 6:	The Bidder should have at least 100 full-time professionals on its payroll in India, out of which at least 40 should have experience in the power sector / infrastructure sector.	We would like to submit that PwC India has exceeding 20,000 full-time employees. The detailed employee list constitutes confidential information and, therefore, cannot be shared even partially.	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
		Supporting Documents Required: “Declaration by Authorized Signatory and employee list certified by HR/ authorised signatory”	In view of the above, we request the Commission to consider relaxing the supporting document requirement under the relevant clause to the following: “Declaration by the Authorized Signatory / Engagement Partner”	
5	Clause: 5, table S. No. 9	9. The Bidder, its leadership team and personnel proposed to be deployed should not have been blacklisted / debarred by any Electricity Regulatory Commission / Government Department / PSU / statutory authority in India in the past. Supporting Documents Required: “Undertaking by Authorised Signatory in prescribed form”	This clause mentions ‘<i>Government Department / PSU / statutory authority in India</i>’ which has very wide and open ended coverage. GERC in its past RfPs has sought very specific declaration covering ERCs/ MOP/MNRE, which is reproduced as under: <i>“The Bidder, its leadership team and its personnel proposed to be deployed for this assignment should not have been blacklisted / debarred by electricity sector regulator / MoP / MNRE in India in the past.”</i>	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.

S.No.	RFP Clause / Page No.	Description as per RFP	Clarification Sought	GERC Response
			We request to amend the clause no. 5 and declaration Form no. VI accordingly.	
6	General Query	-	We request GERC to extend the bid submission deadline and change it to a date which is 2 weeks from the date of issuance of clarification on the queries.	Suitable amendment is made in the RfP.