



January 8, 2022

Consultants

Request for Proposals for Consulting Services for the Review and Evaluation of Field Development Plan (FDP) in Guyana (Yellowtail)

Dear All,

Re: Government of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana, Ministry of Natural Resources – Consulting Services for the Review and Evaluation of Field Development Plan (FDP) in Guyana (Yellowtail)

Request for Proposals – MNR/2022/RFB/FDP-1 – Clarification No. 1

With reference to the issued RFP, the Client hereby issues Clarification No. 1.

Item	Request for Clarification	Clarification
	<i>January 7, 2021</i>	
1.0	Evaluation Criteria and Ranking: the RFP outlines the scoring of the technical proposal but does not provide a weighting between the technical score and the financial proposal. The RFP goes on further to state that “Your proposal will be evaluated and ranked on its merit in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined, however, it does not provide any indication as to how the raking is done. Usually governments assign a weight to the technical and financial proposal which then determines the ranking of bidders. Could you please state how the ranking is going to be determined under this RFP?	<p>The issued RFP does not present a weighting between the technical score and the Financial proposal. With reference to Section A. Letter of Invitation, Item 7, Evaluation Criteria has been Amended to read as follows:</p> <p>The Employer will award the Contract to the Consultant whose Proposal is determined to be substantially responsive to the bidding documents, and who offered the Lowest Evaluated Proposal Price, provided that this Consultant has been determined to be eligible and have met the minimum qualification score of seventy (70) points in accordance with the Criteria in Annex A</p> <p>With reference to Section Appendix -2 – Supplementary Information for Consultants, Item 3. Evaluation of Proposals, this section has been amended to read as follows: Proposals will be evaluated in a two-stage manner, commencing with evaluation of technical proposals and allocation of merit points. The phrase “ranking of the technical proposals” has now been removed as there will be no ranking of Technical scores.</p>

2.0	<p>Timeline: the RFP states that the contract will be for a maximum of 50 days. We are concerned that the contract duration does not take into account the following aspects:</p>	<p>With reference to Section A. Letter of Invitation, Item 11, “It is estimated that approximately fifty (50) days of service will be required for the assignment. You should therefore base your financial proposal on this figure. However, you should feel free to submit your proposal on the basis of man-days considered necessary by you to undertake the assignment.”</p>
(a)	<p>Item 5 on page 17 of the RFP states that “A review committee identified by the Minister of Natural Resources will review all reports of consultants (inception, progress, intermediate and draft final) and suggest any modifications/changes considered necessary within 15 days of receipt. The six week timeline for the total project duration does not account for the MNR feedback and contractor response. Particularly this is impossible between the draft report and final report which are due within 4 weeks and six weeks of contract signature. If two weeks are allowed for the government to provide comments, then zero days are allocated for the Contractor to submit the final report.</p>	<p>With reference to the issued RFP, Appendix 1, Terms of Reference, Item 4, Duration of Assignment, the expected duration of the assignment is fifty (50) days. This time period excludes the review time for MNR and response by the Contractor. The review time will be finalised at the Contract negotiation between the Client and the Consultant. The fifty (50) days for actual work by the Consultant and the agreed review time to be agreed at Contract negotiations will be included to the special Conditions of contract.</p>
(b)	<p>In addition to submitting the draft and final report the RFP requires for the contractor to:</p> <p>Support the MNR’s engagements and information exchanges with the Licensees, including:</p> <p>the formulation of responses and communications to the Licensees..</p> <p>Analyzing and advising on communication received from the Licensees on any revisions made to the FDP so as to ensure that the issues and deficiencies or requested modifications identified in the original FDP have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Provide on-the-job training to the MNR and Sector Regulator during the FDP evaluation process. This shall</p>	<p>It should be noted that GoG’s practice when conducting an FDP review is to continuously engage the Operator through weekly feedback and meetings. This allows for a more efficient conclusion where minimum issues remain outstanding by the end of the review and there is a general understanding of the required next steps towards closure. As such the mentioned communications will be an ongoing process throughout the contract period.</p> <p>Throughout the review, the GoG’s team is expected to meet for discussion and alignment on issues arising prior to sharing with the License. It is the Government’s expectation that while conducting the review, the consultant will be integrated into this process as well. This is an ideal opportunity for knowledge transfer and on-the-job training. The GOG would also accept additional formalized training after submission of the Final FDP if the recommended by the Consultant.</p>

	<p>include regular engagements with GoG technical team at a frequency to be determined.</p> <p>Document the field development review process and outcomes, including references to international best practices and industry standards, in a manner and format to support future reference for similar review exercises and overall improvement of the FDP review process.</p> <p>Most of these tasks are likely to be conducted after the final report has been submitted and will be dependent on the back and forth that may be required with the operator. A 50 day maximum duration does not take into account the time necessary post submission of the final report. In order to avoid subsequent extensions of the contract period as they happened in the case of the Paraya FDP review it is important for the RFP to include the necessary time for such processes. We would also recommend that more flexibility is allowed for on-the job training. With the significantly truncated timeline (from 4 months in the case of the original consulting agreement for the Paraya FDP review—which was then extended to nine months—to six weeks for the Yellowtail) it is going to be very challenging to do the analysis of various aspects of the review process and train people within 4 weeks – which is the time for preparation of the first draft. Under these circumstances we suggest that some of the training is conducted after the submission of the final FDP to allow the reviewers time to do as thorough job as possible within the proposed timeline.</p>	
3.0	<p>Gas utilization: Can the MNR confirm whether the FDP and the ESIA review include analysis of the commercial and environmental aspects of the midstream component, i.e. bringing gas to shore? That is an important component to have clarity on with regard to pricing. The RFP is a</p>	<p>The Petroleum Agreement requires the Licensee to present a gas utilization plan within their FDP which should address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. how gas will be utilized to ensure optimum recovery of crude oil ii. a feasibility study regarding the utilization of excess Associated Gas in relation to Development Plans for each

	bit vague in terms of this aspect so we would appreciate if you could clarify whether this analysis is included in the RFP.	field
4.0	Environmental expert: while the RFP includes the analysis of the ESIA there is no requirement in the RFP for environmental scientists. We suggest this is a very important skill set that needs to be taken into account in the evaluation of the proposals since the review of the ESIA is a very component of the work to be performed.	With reference to the issued RFP, Appendix 1, Terms of Reference, Item 8, Team Composition, The Consultant is expected to bring in specialized expertise from its own organization or otherwise as required in support of the lead experts.

Please confirm in writing the receipt of the Clarification No. 1.

Mr. Joslyn McKenzie
Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Natural Resources