



Corrigendum- II: Clarifications to Queries Received (Email and Pre-Bid Meeting held on 10 August 2026) – RFP No. 5/ISA-MDTF/2026-ISA

Date: 24.08.2026

Subject: RFP for Hiring of Agency for ETP planning in Rajasthan

S.No.	Reference Clause No.	Queries	Response
1	Limitation of Liability (RFP/GTB silent on this clause)	The RFP is silent on Limitation of Liability. Request confirmation that the aggregate liability of the consulting assignment is limited to 100% of the Contract value, along with confirmation of a proposed standard limitation-of-liability clause excluding consequential, indirect, incidental, punitive or exemplary damages, except where losses are judicially determined to have arisen from fraud or bad faith of the Consultant.	As per the RFP
2	ISA GTB, Article 7.0 & 8.0, Page 1–2	The GTB contains broad indemnity obligations (Article 7.0) without any cap on total aggregate financial liability. Request ISA to insert a standard commercial Limitation of Liability clause capping the consultant's total aggregate liability (under indemnity, contract, or tort) to 100% of the Total Contract Value or payment made to the Consultant, while explicitly excluding indirect, special, and consequential damages.	As per the RFP
3	ISA GTB, Article 15.2 & 15.3, Page 4	Article 15.2 gives ISA the right to terminate the contract without cause upon 30 days' written notice. Please confirm that upon such termination, ISA will reimburse the contractor for: (a) all completed and accepted deliverables, (b) pro-rata payment for work-in-progress up to the date of termination, and (c) all unavoidable committed costs incurred by the consultant prior to notice.	As per the RFP



4	ISA GTB, Article 11.2 & 11.4, Page 2–3	Please confirm that while project-specific deliverables generated under the Contract will belong to ISA (Article 11.1/11.4), the consultant retains full ownership of its pre-existing background IP, proprietary algorithms, energy models, and analytical tools used to generate those deliverables, with ISA granted only a non-exclusive, perpetual licence for internal project use.	As per the RFP
5	ISA GTB, Article 16.2, Page 4	Article 16.2 designates UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules but does not specify the physical seat and venue of arbitration. Request ISA to clarify that the seat and venue of arbitration shall be New Delhi, India, and that the language of proceedings shall be English.	As per the RFP
6	GTB Clause 8.4.1 (Name ISA as additional insured)	We maintain a composite professional indemnity and third-party liability insurance in addition to workman's compensation insurance with sufficient coverage to mitigate potential risk; however, we will not be able to endorse the name of the client in the policy. Please confirm if this is acceptable.	As per the RFP
7	Section 2, Instruction to Bidders, Clause 14, Page 9 & 10	Please confirm whether consortium and single-firm proposals will be evaluated on the same basis, or whether consortium proposals will receive any preference.	As per the RFP
8	Section 2, ITB Clause 14; Section 4, Evaluation Criteria, page 9 & 10	In case of a JV/Consortium/Association, how will the individual experience and credentials of each consortium member be considered during technical evaluation?	As per the RFP
9	Section 2, ITB Clause 14.4, Page 10	Can consortium members collectively demonstrate the required expertise across the different thematic areas mentioned in the RFP?	As per the RFP
10	Section 2, ITB Clause 14 / Consortium Provisions, Page 9 & 10	Is there any prescribed minimum or maximum number of members for a consortium?	As per the RFP
11	Section 2, ITB Clause 15.1, Page 10	Could you please confirm whether Nangia & Co LLP can participate in multiple consortiums for this opportunity, wherein Nangia & Co LLP would be a consortium member and different firms would act as the Lead Bidder in each consortium?	As per the RFP Section 2, ITB Clause 15.1.



12	Section 3, BDS Item 8, Page 19	Request ISA to kindly consider amending the Liquidated Damages clause such that, in case of non-satisfactory performance, liquidated damages may be levied at 1% of the total contract sum per week, subject to a maximum of 5% of the total contract sum (in lieu of the current 2.5% per week / 10% cap).	As per the RFP
13	Section 3, BDS Item 8, Page 19	The RFP stipulates liquidated damages of 2.5% per week up to a maximum of 10% of the contract sum for delay or non-satisfactory performance. Please clarify: (a) whether the liquidated-damages cap applies to each milestone or to the overall contract; and (b) how 'non-satisfactory performance' will be assessed, and whether a formal review or dispute-resolution process will take place before liquidated damages are imposed.	As per the RFP
14	Data Dependency (General, relating to BDS Item 8 - Liquidated Damages)	As Energy Transition Planning is a heavily data-dependent exercise, kindly confirm that delays in provision/validation of data, assumptions, stakeholder inputs or approvals attributable to ISA/GoR/state agencies will result in a corresponding extension of the relevant deliverable timelines, without levy of liquidated damages on the consultant.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
15	Section 3, BDS Item 9 (Performance Security) vs Item 6 (Bid Security), Page 20	BDS Item 9 refers to forfeiture of 'EMD' upon failure to furnish Performance Security, while BDS Item 6 (Bid Security) appears inconsistent with this reference. Please clarify whether this is a drafting inconsistency or whether a separate EMD is required in addition to the Bid Security and Performance Security.	As per the RFP
16	Section 3, BDS Item 9 / Section 4, ITB, Page 20/24	In line with standard procurement practices of leading international funding agencies (e.g., World Bank, ADB, KfW), suggest deleting the requirement for a 5% Contract Performance Security. As the payment	As per the RFP



		structure is already heavily back-ended against approved deliverables, a performance security adds administrative burden and financing cost without additional risk mitigation.	
17	Section 3, BDS Item 9, Page 20	Please confirm whether a corporate guarantee or letter of undertaking from the lead firm's parent company would be accepted instead of an unconditional bank guarantee, particularly for entities not registered in India.	As per the RFP
18	Section 3, BDS Item 9, Page 20	Please confirm whether the Performance Security must be denominated in USD or INR.	As per the RFP
19	Section 3, BDS Item 14, Page 20	Kindly request an extension of the submission deadline by 15 days to allow sufficient time for preparation and submission of a comprehensive proposal.	As per the RFP, any revision to the submission timeline shall be communicated to all prospective Bidders through the appropriate corrigendum published on the ISA website.
20	Section 3, BDS Item 16 (Electronic Submission Requirements), Page 19	Confirm whether (a) multiple emails are allowed for submission (Technical and Financial proposals separately and/or split into parts). Technical proposals often exceed the 5 MB file-size limit and clarification in this regard is requested.	Bidders to ensure all the relevant documents properly submitted by the RFP closing date.
21	Section 3, BDS Item 17 / ITB Clause 30.4, Page 21	Request ISA to kindly consider adopting a QCBS evaluation methodology with 80% weightage for the Technical Proposal and 20% weightage for the Financial Proposal (in lieu of the current 70%-30% distribution).	As per the RFP
22	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria	Kindly clarify whether any exemption or relaxation under the applicable MSME policy is available for eligible MSME bidders under this tender, particularly with respect to eligibility requirements, tender conditions.	As per the RFP
23	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, Page 22	It is observed that the Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria shall be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis; however, the RFP does not clearly specify the parameters or threshold against which compliance would be assessed (unlike the Technical Evaluation Criteria, which specifies a minimum qualifying threshold of 70 marks). Request that	As per the RFP



		the basis/threshold for evaluating the Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria on a Pass/Fail basis be clarified.	
24	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 1, Page 23	Request ISA to kindly clarify whether the term 'related infrastructure sectors' (0-1 / 1-5 / above 5 years of operation in energy, clean energy, or related infrastructure sectors) includes energy-sector-related infrastructure projects only, or whether general civil infrastructure projects also count as relevant experience.	In accordance with the provisions of the RFP, the primary focus shall remain on energy-related projects (planning and relevant technical assistance in nature) comprehensively encompassing all pertinent sectoral aspects of the proposed scope of work.
25	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 2, Page 23	With reference to the evaluation criteria for project experience, kindly clarify the specific quantitative criteria used to define a 'Large-Scale Project'. Without an explicit quantitative threshold (e.g., MW capacity or contract value), the term remains subjective; explicit parameters would ensure transparent evaluation and allow bidders to submit the most relevant project credentials.	As stipulated in the RFP, Bidders must furnish credentials of relevant past engagements demonstrating their capability and competence to successfully deliver all constituent elements of the proposed work.
26	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 2, Page 23	Request ISA to kindly clarify the basis on which 'large-scale projects' will be determined – whether by project value, project coverage/capacity, or another criterion – and, if possible, specify the threshold or range for such classification.	As stipulated in the RFP, Bidders must furnish credentials of relevant past engagements demonstrating their capability and competence to successfully deliver all constituent elements of the proposed work.
27	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 2, Page 23	It is assumed that large-scale energy infrastructure projects executed in other countries, such as waste-to-energy (WtE) plants, large-scale municipal projects, and biomass gasification plants, are considered eligible for qualification under this criterion. Please confirm.	As stipulated in the RFP, Bidders must furnish credentials of relevant past engagements demonstrating their capability and competence to successfully deliver all constituent elements of the proposed work.
28	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 3, Page 24	We understand that both completed and ongoing assignments/projects shall be considered for evaluation under this criterion (demonstrated expertise in at least 4 of the listed areas). Kindly confirm.	As stipulated in the RFP, Bidders must furnish credentials of relevant past engagements demonstrating their capability and competence to successfully deliver all constituent elements of the proposed work.



29	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 3, Page 24	It is assumed that all types of renewable plants, including biomass power plants and waste-to-energy (WtE) facilities, are eligible for consideration under 'demonstrated expertise in at least 4' of the listed thematic areas. Please confirm.	As stipulated in the RFP, Bidders must furnish credentials of relevant past engagements demonstrating their capability and competence to successfully deliver all constituent elements of the proposed work.
30	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 4, Page 24	Request ISA to kindly clarify the minimum qualification and experience requirements expected for the experts proposed under this criterion (full-time professional count tiers).	Pursuant to the RFP, Bidders shall ensure that the proposed pool of professionals possesses adequate qualifications and relevant experience to fully satisfy the technical and operational requirements of the proposed work.
31	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Criterion 4, Page 24	Kindly clarify whether the number of full-time professionals will be assessed at the bidder organisation level, consortium level, or only for the proposed project team. Further, clarify whether associates/partner firm resources can be counted for meeting this requirement.	As per the RFP
32	Section 4, Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria – Overall Approach & Methodology, Page 25	Request ISA to kindly clarify whether specific state planning documents and sector strategies are expected to be adopted as mandatory reference frameworks for 'integration with national/state frameworks', and hope such documents would be provided during the kick-off meeting.	As per the RFP
33	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2 (Experience in Integrated Energy Planning & Modelling) Page 25 & Section 5, Role of the Agency, Page 33	Is the choice of modelling platform (e.g., LEAP, TIMES, PLEXOS, HOMER) left entirely to the selected agency, or does ISA/GoR have a preferred/mandated tool (e.g., for compatibility with any existing State model)?	As per Section 5 of the RFP, Page 33, the Agency may use any suitable platform for simulations and load flow analysis, provided that the selected tools ensure adequate accuracy and comply with applicable cybersecurity and data privacy requirements of CEA, CERC, Government of Rajasthan, and other relevant authorities.



34	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	Request to allow bidders using proprietary/in-house developed modelling tools and platforms in addition to off-the-shelf software (LEAP, TIMES, PLEXOS, etc.). Bidders with integrated IT and Power Domain teams deploying custom, validated analytical tools for load forecasting, storage optimisation, and RE grid integration should be considered equally eligible under the advanced-modelling scoring tier.	As per Section 5 of the RFP, Page 33, the Agency may use any suitable platform for simulations and load flow analysis, provided that the selected tools ensure adequate accuracy and comply with applicable cybersecurity and data privacy requirements of CEA, CERC, Government of Rajasthan, and other relevant authorities.
35	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	We understand that experience in using in-house tools and models shall also be considered under this criterion, and that modelling may be undertaken on any suitable platform. Kindly confirm.	As per Section 5 of the RFP, Page 33, the Agency may use any suitable platform for simulations and load flow analysis, provided that the selected tools ensure adequate accuracy and comply with applicable cybersecurity and data privacy requirements of CEA, CERC, Government of Rajasthan, and other relevant authorities.
36	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	We hope the data for energy modelling, and adequate historical/planning data for adequate number of years, would be provided by JVVNL/ISA for the required analysis period, including short-term, medium-term, and long-term adequacy assessment.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
37	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	Request ISA to kindly confirm whether digital SLDs and other relevant network planning inputs will be provided by ISA/JVVNL within the required timelines.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP



			deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
38	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	Confirm whether equivalent proprietary/open-source tools (in place of LEAP, TIMES, PLEXOS, HOMER) will be scored equally.	As per Section 5 of the RFP, Page 33, the Agency may use any suitable platform for simulations and load flow analysis, provided that the selected tools ensure adequate accuracy and comply with applicable cybersecurity and data privacy requirements of CEA, CERC, Government of Rajasthan, and other relevant authorities.
39	Section 4, Technical Criteria 2, Page 25	Please confirm whether international state- or national-level energy planning assignments outside India are eligible for the 20-point advanced-modelling tier, or whether this tier applies only to experience in India.	As per the RFP
40	Section 4, Technical Criteria 3 (DPRs and Project Pipelines / Bankable Finance Projects), Page 25	Request to broaden the scope of this criterion to include experience in Project Management Agency (PMA)/Project Management Consultancy (PMC) assignments for RE projects, alongside DPR preparation. Assignments involving implementation tracking and commissioning oversight under PMA scope may be considered equivalent to DPRs/pipelines for scoring, as PMA experience reflects practical execution capability rather than only report preparation.	As per the RFP
41	Section 4, Technical Criteria 3, Page 25	We request ISA to kindly clarify whether prefeasibility studies and project preparation reports will also be considered equivalent to DPRs for the purpose of evaluation under this criterion.	As per the RFP



42	Section 4, Technical Criteria 3, Page 25	Kindly clarify what shall be considered as 'Demonstrated implementation outcomes' for the purpose of scoring, and the acceptable supporting documents (e.g., signed PPAs, LoAs, work orders, tender documents, DPR approvals, financial closure, project commissioning, implementation certificates).	As per the RFP
43	Section 4, Technical Criteria 3, Page 25	It is assumed that work performed outside India shall be considered for evaluation and scored at a national level (under 'Capacity to Translate Strategies into DPRs and Project Pipelines'). Please confirm.	As per the RFP
44	Section 4, Technical Criteria 4 (Geographic and Institutional Coverage), Page 26	We understand that there is only one 'Big 4' firm in India which has a MoU/partnership through a funding agency with select states. This requirement seems to restrict equal participation of a wider pool of bidders who bring the desired technical skills, competency and prior work experience in Energy Transition planning and with the Government of Rajasthan. Request to relax this requirement and consider an alternative scoring scale: Work in 3 states – 5 points; Work in ≥5 states or with central/state utilities – 10 points.	As per the RFP
45	Section 4, Technical Criteria 4, Page 26	Consulting firms primarily engage with DISCOMs, SLDCs, and Nodal Agencies through formal Work Orders, Consultancy Contracts, or Retainerships rather than MoUs/Corporate Partnerships, as public procurement rules and conflict-of-interest guidelines usually limit private consulting firms from entering into open-ended MoUs with state utilities. Kindly amend the criteria for the maximum points (10 points) to include 'Multi-year engagements, framework agreements, or continuous retainerships/PMC assignments with utilities' alongside or in lieu of MoUs/partnerships.	As per the RFP
46	Section 4, Technical Criteria 4, Page 26	Request ISA to kindly clarify the documentary evidence expected for demonstrating strategic partnerships and institutional engagements under 'Deep engagement' (e.g., MoUs, client certificates, collaboration agreements, or similar documents).	As per the RFP



47	Section 4, Technical Criteria 4, Page 26	It is assumed that work carried out for Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) at a global level, particularly outside India, is considered under the 'deep engagement' scoring category. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
48	Section 4, Technical Criteria 4, Page 26	Please confirm whether formal Memoranda of Understanding with state energy departments or utilities outside India are considered equivalent to MoUs with Indian state agencies for the 10-point 'deep engagement' tier.	As per the RFP
49	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5 (Strategic Partnerships and Stakeholder Engagement; On-ground Implementation Support), Page 26	Consulting firms interact with government, multilateral agencies, and private-sector players on a client-consultant assignment basis (via Work Orders, Contracts, or Advisory Panels) rather than formal 'Partnerships', due to conflict-of-interest guidelines. Request to amend the terminology of 'Partnerships' to 'Completed/Ongoing Advisory Assignments or Projects executed for/in association with' government, multilateral, or private sector entities.	As stipulated in the RFP, the term "Partnerships" shall include completed and/or ongoing advisory assignments or projects executed for or in association with government, multilateral, or private-sector entities. Such experience shall be substantiated through Work Orders, Financial Closure Certificates and Work Completion Certificates.
50	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5, Page 26	What constitutes a 'strategic partnership'? Do completed and ongoing engagements with relevant agencies qualify as a partnership?	As stipulated in the RFP, the term "Partnerships" shall include completed and/or ongoing advisory assignments or projects executed for or in association with government, multilateral, or private-sector entities. Such experience shall be substantiated through Work Orders, Financial Closure Certificates and Work Completion Certificates.
51	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5, Page 26	Kindly clarify what types of arrangements will qualify as 'partnerships', and whether project-specific consortium arrangements, client contracts, MoUs, framework agreements, sub-consultancy arrangements, or prior collaboration with	As stipulated in the RFP, the term "Partnerships" shall include completed and/or ongoing advisory assignments or projects executed for or in association with government, multilateral, or private-sector



		government/multilateral/private-sector agencies will be accepted as evidence.	entities. Such experience shall be substantiated through Work Orders, Financial Closure Certificates and Work Completion Certificates.
52	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5, Page 26	Please clarify whether sub-consultant engagements under programmes funded by multilateral organisations such as ADB, the World Bank, GIZ, or UNDP qualify as partnerships under this criterion, or whether only direct contractual engagements are recognised.	As stipulated in the RFP, the term “Partnerships” shall include completed and/or ongoing advisory assignments or projects executed for or in association with government, multilateral, or private-sector entities. Such experience shall be substantiated through Work Orders, Financial Closure Certificates and Work Completion Certificates.
53	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5, Page 26	Please clarify if the '2 additional points' for stakeholder engagement is cumulative on top of the 18-point tier, since 8+10+18+2 sequencing risks exceeding the stated 20-point cap for this criterion.	As per the RFP
54	Section 4, Technical Criteria 5, Page 26	Similarly to the Geographic Coverage criterion, it is assumed that project-level work executed for MDBs in other countries within the renewable energy or energy infrastructure sectors is considered for evaluation under Strategic Partnerships and Stakeholder Engagement. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
55	Section 4, Technical Criteria 6 (Team Structure, location and pool of experts), Page 26	With reference to the evaluation of the proposed team composition, kindly specify the minimum required number of experts, minimum years of experience, and specific qualification criteria for each expert role (e.g., Energy Modeller, T&D Planning Specialist, EE/DSM Expert, Finance and Investment Specialist, Project Management/Stakeholder Engagement Specialist). Additionally, please clarify the evaluation matrix/scoring distribution for individual team positions to ensure structured scoring.	Pursuant to the RFP, Bidders shall ensure that the proposed pool of professionals possesses adequate qualifications and relevant experience to fully satisfy the technical and operational requirements of the proposed work.



56	Section 4, Technical Criteria 6, Page 26	Is full-time on-site presence in Rajasthan required throughout the project, or will a hybrid/remote deployment model with periodic site visits be acceptable? If full-time on-site deployment is required, will suitable office space and basic working facilities be provided by the Energy Department/ISA, or are bidders expected to make their own arrangements?	As per the RFP
57	'Deployment of experts locally at HQ' (Section 4, Technical Criteria 6, Page 26)	Kindly confirm whether we need to depute any personnel to coordinate directly with the department for the entire duration of the project.	Pursuant to the RFP, Bidders shall ensure that a pool of professionals possesses adequate qualifications and relevant experience to fully deliver the technical and operational requirements of the proposed work in close collaboration with Energy department Rajasthan.
58	Section 4, Technical Presentation Requirement, Page 26	Request ISA to kindly share the evaluation weightage, duration, format, and key expectations of the technical presentation.	As per the RFP, and subsequent communications from ISA on the subject matter.
59	Section 4, Minimum Eligibility – Previous Experience, Page 23 & Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Page 26	Kindly clarify the applicable look-back period for considering credentials under the technical evaluation criteria. While the qualification form refers to similar assignments completed in the last 3 years, the technical evaluation criteria do not clearly specify this requirement. Request that the look-back period for considering project credentials under both the Minimum Eligibility Criteria and Technical Evaluation Criteria be extended to seven (7) years.	As per the RFP
60	Financial Proposal / RFP Conditions	Could you please clarify whether there is an indicative/estimated budget or ceiling for this assignment?	Bidders should submit financial proposal covering all the relevant cost estimated to deliver the proposed scope as per the RFP
61	Section 5, ToR & Section 4, Evaluation Criteria, Page 24–35	To ensure transparency, fair competition, and parity in bid pricing among all bidders, request ISA to specify the expected manpower competencies along with an estimated Level of Effort (person-months) for key and non-key experts.	Pursuant to the RFP, Bidders shall ensure that the proposed pool of professionals possesses adequate qualifications and relevant experience to fully satisfy the technical and



			operational requirements of the proposed work in close collaboration with Energy department Rajasthan.
62	Section 5, Role of the Agency, Page 33 & Section 4, Technical Criteria 6, Page 26	For Workstream 2 specifically (given the need for close coordination with SLDC/RVPN on network data and grid studies), is a dedicated on-site presence in Jaipur expected for the full 12-month duration, or is periodic on-site deployment (aligned with data-collection/workshop milestones) acceptable, supplemented by remote analytical work?	As per the RFP
63	Section 5, ToR – 'establish the baseline for future planning' (Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29)	Presently, information available in the public domain and on government websites is being considered for the study and for establishing the baseline. Please confirm if any further confidential or specific information requirements will be provided by ISA or GoR.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
64	Section 5, ToR, Workstream 1 & 2 Scope, Pages 29–30	Will existing studies, demand forecasts, resource-adequacy assessments, renewable-energy integration studies, transmission plans and other planning reports developed by state agencies be shared with the selected agency as baseline inputs for the assignment?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.



65	Section 5, Clause 1.4 (About ISA and the Multi-donor Trust Fund), Page 28	Kindly provide the list of all donors/contributors to ISA's Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). This is required to undertake internal conflict-of-interest and independence checks before submission of the proposal.	The exhaustive list of MDTF contributors is not subject to disclosure at this stage. Bidders shall conduct their conflict-of-interest assessments based on publicly available information and submit the requisite declarations as stipulated in the RFP.
66	Section 5, ToR, General	It is understood that the deliverables will comprise development of relevant strategy documents and identification of relevant projects, and will not entail design of pilots or preparation of procurement documents.	As per the RFP
67	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that the models developed under this engagement are not required to be handed over to ISA/GoR upon completion, as the consultant may use proprietary tools for the same; and that only base files of models developed on commercial tools (such as PSS/E) may be handed over. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
68	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	In case any required dataset is unavailable, incomplete or delayed, we understand that we can utilise publicly available data and industry benchmarks, as per mutual agreement with ISA and GoR, and carry out the assessment. Please confirm.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
69	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that the collection of data from DISCOMs, TRANSCO, SLDC, Government departments and other relevant energy-sector agencies in Rajasthan shall be facilitated by ISA through coordination with the respective stakeholders; and that wherever data is to be obtained through online portals or APIs, the necessary user credentials,	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of



		access permissions, and API access (where applicable) shall be arranged and provided by ISA in coordination with the respective agencies. Kindly confirm.	the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
70	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Support from GoR-ISA is sought in the form of a letter of authorisation for collecting data, as well as a letter to GoR entities requesting they provide necessary support and data in a timely manner.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
71	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We hope the data for energy modelling – including adequate historical and planning data for the relevant number of years – would be made available by ISA/JVVNL.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.



72	Section 5, Workstream 1 Data Availability, Page 29	We understand that the required data shall be provided to the Consultant by a single point of contact appointed by ISA/Energy Department within a stipulated timeline. Please confirm the mechanism/timeline for ISA/Energy Department to facilitate data-sharing access/NDAs with utilities, as this is critical-path for Workstreams 1, 2 and 5.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
73	Section 5, Workstream 1 Pt.2, Page 29	This activity primarily deals with data collection. We understand that the data – including SLDC data pertaining to 15-minute load consumption data that may be required for mapping the respective DISCOM's load curve, along with generation curves of the generators – will be made available to the Consultant in electronic mode/form. Please confirm.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
74	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	ISA to provide the necessary nomination letter, supporting documents, or a suitable introductory meeting to facilitate ease of data collection. Since reviewing grid-related information and grid data modelling requires strict permission from the DISCOMs, it is assumed that no charges need to be paid to acquire this grid data.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder



			consultations to meet the established project timelines.
75	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Confirm: (a) which specific datasets GoR/DISCOMs/TRANSCO/SLDC will proactively share versus what the agency must independently source; (b) the historical depth (number of years) and granularity (hourly/15-min/daily) of load, generation and network data that will be made available; and (c) the expected turnaround time for data requests raised with State agencies during the engagement.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
76	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Please indicate the approximate number/scale of PPAs and projects to be reviewed (e.g., all utility-scale RE PPAs signed by Rajasthan DISCOMs to date, or a representative sample), and confirm whether GoR/DISCOMs will provide a consolidated PPA register or whether the agency must compile this independently.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
77	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that all relevant data relating to existing PPAs, procurement plans, and associated contractual information will be made available to the selected consultant. Kindly confirm.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP



			deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
78	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Please confirm whether the PPAs signed and available in the public domain shall be considered for the study, or whether specific relevant information will be provided by ISA/GoR.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
79	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	It is requested to clarify whether 'contractual flexibility' (in reviewing existing PPAs and upcoming projects) encompasses options for early PPA surrender or non-renewal upon contract expiration.	As per the RFP
80	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that the time horizon for the IRP (Integrated Resource Planning) exercise is 2035. Kindly confirm.	As per the RFP
81	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	For developing the integrated resource-planning model, granular data such as substation-wise demand/load profiles, generator-to-substation mapping, generator-wise generation profiles, PSS/E files and network data would be required. Could you please confirm whether such granular data will be made available by the relevant state agencies/utilities, and what the timelines for providing the data are?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary



			information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
82	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	The generation and storage modelling would require assumptions such as CAPEX, fixed and variable O&M costs, plant life, efficiency/heat rate, minimum technical load, etc. Could you please clarify whether these assumptions will be provided by the client, or whether the consultant is expected to develop and benchmark these assumptions independently?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
83	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	For the IRP exercise, generation profiles of the existing power plants as well as their PPAs will be required, including for older plants. It is assumed that these will be provided by the client. Please confirm.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
84	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	It is requested to clarify whether the analysis of thermal technical minimum below 55% is envisaged.	As per the RFP
85	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Kindly confirm the number and definition of scenarios expected (e.g., Business-as-Usual, State Policy-aligned/125 GW target,	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage



		Accelerated/Central schemes-aligned) and the required time-resolution for capacity-expansion vs. dispatch modelling (e.g., annual capacity blocks vs. hourly/sub-hourly dispatch simulation for storage and curtailment analysis).	
86	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that the load-curve evolution and future peak-shift assessment shall be carried out at hourly granularity, considering key demand-side drivers such as rooftop solar penetration, EV charging demand, agricultural load shifting, open access migration, demand response measures, T&D loss reduction trajectory, and C&I load shifting (where applicable); and that the required historical hourly demand data and supporting datasets for modelling these demand-side drivers shall be facilitated by ISA through the respective agencies. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
87	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	For assessing RE integration and storage requirements, could you please confirm whether historical RE curtailment and renewable-generation profiles will be provided? Also, will assumptions around storage efficiency, charging/discharging constraints, minimum/maximum state of charge, degradation and cycling requirements be provided, or are these expected to be developed by the consultant?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
88	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	The complete transmission network data, including the existing network, planned transmission upgrades, substation details, and associated planning assumptions, shall be facilitated by ISA through the concerned agencies. Kindly confirm our understanding.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of

			the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
89	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	It is requested to clarify if the storage scope (BESS, Pumped Storage) requires only capacity quantification (MW/MWh), or if site-specific location identification is also expected.	As per the RFP
90	Section 5, Workstream 1 Pt.6, Page 29	We understand that the consultant will provide the overall requirement of integration of BESS/PSP storage requirements at state level as per the transition plan; however, identification of individual locations is not under the scope of the Consultant. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
91	Section 5, Workstream 1 Key Deliverables, Page 29	Is there a specific reliability/firming standard the storage sizing should target (e.g., minimum X-hour RTC firming, specific peak-shortfall coverage, or alignment with MoP's RE+storage tendering norms/RTC PSP-BESS bundling guidelines)? Should the analysis align to any existing GoR/CEA resource-adequacy framework already in use for Rajasthan?	As per the RFP
92	Section 5, Workstream 1 Key Deliverables, Page 29	Please clarify the expected number of pilot hybrid clusters, indicative site-selection criteria (or whether sites will be nominated by GoR/DISCOMs), and whether 'design' is expected at a conceptual/pre-feasibility level or a more detailed technical design level.	As per the RFP
93	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	To ensure appropriate estimation of effort and alignment with the intended scope, kindly clarify the specific retrofit strategies envisaged for thermal and RE assets. Further, please clarify the intended scope of 'bundling' and the expectations under 'balancing' (e.g., 'Bundling, Banking, and Balancing').	As per the RFP
94	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Kindly clarify whether the scope of developing projectisation concepts (for RE procurement, RE+storage systems, grid strengthening and DSM) is limited to conceptual projectisation or whether it extends to DPR-level development.	As per the RFP



95	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Kindly clarify the specific DRE applications expected to be evaluated for the cost-benefit analysis. To enable appropriate estimation of effort, propose restricting the assessment to up to five representative DRE applications. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage
96	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	We understand that the cost-benefit assessment, scale-up potential, and economic value mapping for DRE applications shall be undertaken at the overall state/system level rather than at individual location or regional levels. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	As per the RFP
97	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	Given that ancillary services/real-time market design largely falls under CERC/POSOCO's regulatory purview at the national level, please clarify the expected depth of the demand-side flexibility and market-based mechanisms analysis for a State-level ETP – i.e., is Workstream 1 expected to (a) assess Rajasthan's readiness/participation potential in existing national mechanisms, or (b) propose new State-level market mechanisms?	As per the RFP
98	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope, Page 29	To facilitate an appropriate estimation of effort, we understand that the assessment of major solution providers, recent deployments, tender/RFP outcomes, and leading case studies shall be limited to a representative set covering the identified technologies, with the assessment limited to up to 5 representative case studies per technology. Kindly confirm if this approach is acceptable.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage
99	Section 5, Workstream 1 Scope & Key Deliverables, Page 29	Should the technology and market benchmarking (solution providers, case studies, RFP/tender analysis, cost trends) be limited to the Indian market/tenders (SECI, state DISCOM tenders, Rajasthan-specific RFPs), or is a global/international benchmarking exercise (relevant to ISA's mandate across member countries) also expected under Workstream 1?	As per the RFP
100	Section 5, Workstream 1 Key Deliverables, Page 29 vs. Workstream 4, Page 31	Kindly clarify the demarcation between Workstream 1's 'Investment Needs & Procurement Strategy Roadmap' and Workstream 4's generation-related projectisation output, to avoid duplicated deliverables – e.g., does Workstream 1 produce the strategy/roadmap	As per the RFP



		while Workstream 4 converts the generation-side priorities into individual investment-ready project briefs?	
101	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Does ISA expect detailed network studies (e.g., load flow, short-circuit and stability analysis using utility-grade network models and software), or strategic planning-level assessments based on available utility data and existing studies?	In accordance with the provisions of the RFP, the Agency is required to deliver the proposed scope of work based on available data from pertinent sources. Ensuring the adequacy, completeness, and suitability of the required data rests solely with the Agency.
102	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the base T&D network of Rajasthan is available. Please confirm the format in which the network and operational data will be made available – whether in the form of PSS/E/relevant tools, or in another digitised format compatible with the relevant tool to be used for network studies.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage
103	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that no field-level validation is required, and that validation can be carried out on the basis of discussions and technical discussions with the relevant counterpart team only. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
104	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Please confirm whether RVPN/DISCOMs will provide an existing network model/GIS database (single-line diagrams, substation-wise loading, feeder-level data) usable as a base case, or whether the agency is expected to build the network model from primary data collection. Also confirm the voltage levels for which digitised network data currently exists.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.



105	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that network models, planning studies, and system data required for load flow, short-circuit and grid-stability analyses will be provided by the relevant utilities. Kindly confirm.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
106	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	In case validated simulation-ready network models are not available, kindly clarify whether development and validation of the complete transmission/sub-transmission network model from raw utility data is envisaged within the scope of the selected agency.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
107	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Please confirm whether consultants will be provided with an existing working model of Rajasthan's transmission and distribution system in software such as PSS/E, CYME, or DigSILENT PowerFactory, or whether they will be expected to build the models from raw data provided by the state's T&D utilities. Please also clarify the voltage levels to be covered in the T&D studies and the expected level of modelling detail.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder



			consultations to meet the established project timelines.
108	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	For the network planning exercise, granular operational data such as substation/feeder-wise load profiles, load fluctuations, outages, congestion, generation injections and RE evacuation data would be required. Could you please confirm whether this level of data will be available from the relevant utilities/SLDC?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
109	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	(A) Please clarify the specific types and granularity of state-level data that will be made available to the consultant (e.g., hourly/15-minute load curves from DISCOMs, substation-level nodal capacity, generator-wise heat rates/variable costs, PPA terms, and outage history). (B) Please share the current power system and planning software engines currently operational within Rajasthan's state power utilities.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
110	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the collection of data from DISCOMs, TRANSCO, SLDC, Government departments and other relevant energy-sector agencies in Rajasthan shall be facilitated by ISA through coordination	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall



		with the respective stakeholders, and that where data is to be obtained through online portals or APIs, the necessary user credentials, access permissions, and API access shall be arranged and provided by ISA in coordination with the respective agencies. Kindly confirm.	adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
111	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	ISA to provide the necessary nomination letter, supporting documents, or a suitable introductory meeting to facilitate ease of data collection. Since reviewing grid-related information and grid data modelling requires strict permission from the DISCOMs, it is assumed that no charges need to be paid to acquire this grid data. Please specify the preferred modelling tool (e.g., PSS/E or ETAP) to perform these grid studies.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
112	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Kindly clarify the network boundary and voltage levels to be covered under Workstream 2, separately for transmission, sub-transmission and distribution networks.	As per the RFP
113	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope & Key Deliverables, Page 30	(a) Is a specific power-system simulation platform mandated (e.g., PSS/E, DigSILENT PowerFactory, ETAP) for compatibility with RVPN/SLDC's existing systems, or is tool selection left to the agency? (b) Please confirm the voltage-level boundary for this analysis – is it limited to the intra-state EHV/HV transmission network (400kV/220kV/132kV), or does it extend to 33/11kV distribution network studies?	As per the RFP



114	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	In case of current capacity and performance assessment of state transmission and distribution infrastructure, kindly confirm whether a representative sampling methodology followed by extrapolation to DISCOM/State level may be adopted instead of assessment of the complete distribution network. In case it is representative sampling, please confirm the sample sizing.	As per the RFP
115	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that this requirement (benchmark T&D losses against state targets) is limited to analysis and benchmarking of reported utility/system-level T&D losses only, and that independent technical-loss calculation through detailed electrical network modelling at voltage/feeder/DT level is not envisaged. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.	In accordance with the provisions of the RFP, the Agency is required to deliver the proposed scope of work based on available data from pertinent sources. Ensuring the adequacy, completeness, and suitability of the required data rests solely with the Agency.
116	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Please confirm the source and vintage of the 'state targets' to be used as the T&D loss benchmark (e.g., RERC-approved AT&C loss trajectory, RDSS targets, or a GoR-specific target), and whether DISCOM-wise/feeder-wise loss data (versus only state-aggregate loss data) will be made available.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
117	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	To enable an appropriate estimation of the required effort, propose restricting the detailed small-signal/transient stability assessment to up to 10 representative critical contingencies, to be finalised in consultation with ISA/GoR during project execution. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage



118	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that ISA/GoR shall provide/facilitate details of the existing network, and all planned and under-construction generation and transmission upgrades for the relevant planning horizon, in appropriate formats that can support network studies; these models shall form the basis for the proposed load flow, short-circuit, contingency, and stability studies. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable. We also understand that the stability studies will be performed at specific nodes in consultation with GoR and not the entire network; if yes, please confirm the indicative number of nodes.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
119	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the generation and transmission expansion planning exercise will be undertaken as an integrated capacity expansion study, with transmission power flows modelled using a DC Optimal Power Flow (DCOPF) framework, and that the network model will include transmission and sub-transmission systems up to the 132 kV voltage level (with downstream loads represented as lumped loads at the respective 132 kV substations); detailed transmission planning and network modelling below 132 kV is assumed to be outside the scope of this assignment. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable. Further, to enable appropriate estimation of effort, kindly provide the number of substations/buses/transmission lines at each voltage level/transformation-ratio level proposed to be included in the planning study.	As per the RFP
120	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	To facilitate an appropriate estimation of effort and commercial scope, we understand that the assessment of grid requirements under multiple demand and RE scenarios shall be limited to up to five representative demand and RE scenarios, to be finalised in consultation with the Client. Kindly confirm.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage



121	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Kindly specify whether contingency studies (under the 'model grid requirements/contingency analysis' scope item) are expected on N-1, N-1-1 or other applicable planning criteria.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage
122	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the selected bidder will be provided with a base network model (SLDs) for transmission/sub-transmission and distribution level along with asset details, and will not have to build the model in the tool. We would also request clarification of the intended depth of grid-stability analysis, including whether it is limited to planning-level/steady-state assessments or includes detailed transient, voltage, frequency and/or small-signal stability studies.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
123	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	In case dynamic stability studies are envisaged, kindly confirm whether validated dynamic models and parameters for generators, inverter-based RE resources, BESS, HVDC/FACTS and other relevant assets, as applicable, will be provided by the concerned agencies.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
124	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that consultants are open to propose an appropriate industry-standard tool. Where existing utility models are maintained on proprietary platforms, kindly confirm whether necessary software/model access will be provided and data made available in downloadable digital format.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability,



			the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
125	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the scope of the Grid Operations & Digital Modernisation Roadmap (covering forecasting, scheduling, balancing, congestion management, PMU/WAMS or similar, and real-time monitoring) is limited to development of a strategic roadmap comprising recommendations and implementation frameworks, and is assumed to exclude development or implementation of operational tools and procedures (day-to-day scheduling decisions, short-term forecasting systems, real-time monitoring solutions, PMU/WAMS deployment design, or other operational studies). Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	As per the RFP
126	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Is Workstream 2 expected to deliver only a needs-assessment/roadmap-level recommendation for PMU/WAMS and digital platforms, or a detailed technical specification/BoQ suitable for direct procurement/tendering by GoR? Please also confirm if any PMU/WAMS deployment already exists in Rajasthan that should be treated as the baseline.	As per the RFP and further close consultation with ISA/GoR at the contracting stage
127	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	It is assumed that forecasting requirements shall be outlined in the study; however, detailed energy forecasting shall not be included in this scope since it is a specialised study carried out by specific agencies only. Only recommendations and tool usage shall be mentioned.	As per the RFP
128	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We assume that the details of the existing Green Energy Corridors, available transmission capacities, planned corridor expansions, pooling stations, and other associated transmission infrastructure shall be made available to the selected consultant by ISA/GoR. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability,



			the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
129	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope & Key Deliverables, Page 30	Will GoR/RVPN share existing Green Energy Corridor (GEC-II/III) project documentation, REZ studies and the current queue of ~60 GW awaiting transmission connectivity (as cited in the RFP) as a starting dataset, or is the agency expected to independently reconstruct this connectivity queue?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, however, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the agency must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
130	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the scope of the cost-reduction/shared-infrastructure and modular substation design item is limited to providing planning-level recommendations and design principles based on the outcomes of the planning studies, and does not include detailed substation engineering, physical layout development, equipment selection, or EPC-level design. Kindly confirm if this understanding is acceptable.	As per the RFP
131	Section 5, Workstream 2 Key Deliverables, Page 30	We understand that the expectation under 'Regulatory Reform Plan' is to highlight the key reforms and amendments required in intra-state market and regulatory frameworks to enable alignment with the Capacity Expansion Plan, and that the consultant is not expected to frame or specify the detailed contours of such framework/regulations/codes but only specify planning-level and strategic changes/amendments/reforms required. Please confirm if this is correct.	As per the RFP, the expectation under the Regulatory Reform Plan is limited to the identification of key reforms and amendments required at the strategic/planning level, to enable alignment with the Capacity Expansion Plan.



132	Section 5, Workstream 2 Key Deliverables, Page 30	We understand that 'layer' (Investment Plan by layer and utility) refers to the voltage/transformation ratio at which the investment is envisaged. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
133	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	Should the TBCB (Tariff-Based Competitive Bidding) recommendations align with the existing CEA/CTU/POSOCO framework for interstate transmission, adapted to intra-state (RVPN) bundling, or is a Rajasthan-specific bundling framework expected to be designed from first principles? Please specify the historical look-back period expected for the grid-events analysis (e.g., last 3 years of grid disturbance reports) and confirm whether SLDC/RVPN grid-event/disturbance reports will be made available, given these are often treated as sensitive operational records.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
134	Section 5, Workstream 2 Scope, Page 30	We understand that the scope includes assessment of existing IT/OT applications and digital platforms, such as SCADA, EMS, PMU/WAMS, and other related utility systems. Kindly confirm.	As per the RFP
135	Section 5, Workstream 3 Scope, Pages 30–31	For Workstream 3, is the agency expected to only design, or also operationalise/establish, the Project Aggregator and CEFF? The Scope text uses the phrase 'design and operationalise', but the corresponding Key Deliverables list only design-level outputs (Institutional Design Blueprint, Financing Facility Design recommendations); establishing/operationalising these institutions would represent a materially different scope, team composition and cost.	As per the RFP
136	Section 5, Workstream 3 Scope, Pages 30–31	We request ISA to kindly clarify whether the assignment includes support for the operationalisation of the proposed institutional mechanisms (Project Aggregator and CEFF), or whether the scope is limited to design recommendations only.	As per the RFP
137	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	For Workstream 4, are the 20–30 'investment-ready project concepts' expected at concept/pre-feasibility level, or full DPR level? The Scope text refers to 'pre-feasibility and conceptual studies' and the Key Deliverables specify 'approx costs' in Project Briefs, suggesting a	As per the RFP



		concept-level output; however, Section 4's Technical Evaluation Criterion 3 references bidder experience in delivering 'DPRs'. Clarifying the expected level of detail is essential, as it has a significant bearing on level of effort, resourcing and cost.	
138	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	For the identified 20-30 priority projects, is the expected output limited to project concepts/pre-feasibility level assessments, or does ISA expect preparation of Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) for any shortlisted projects?	As per the RFP
139	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	We request ISA to kindly clarify the expected level of project development, including whether the outputs are expected in the form of concept notes, prefeasibility studies, or bankable DPRs.	As per the RFP
142	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	We understand that under this scope, the consultant's responsibility will be to prepare the project scope and not to run the bid process management. Kindly clarify.	As per the RFP
143	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	We understand that no detailed system studies are required at the entire 33/11 kV level, and that the prioritisation has to be done through empirical analysis on key regions/pockets which showcase the best value proposition for investments; this would be finalised on the basis of consultation with the relevant utilities/counterpart team, and once the top 10-20 locations at 33/11 kV level are revealed, the consultant will perform detailed network studies to determine the exact requirement of system strengthening/upgrades required. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.	As per the RFP
144	Section 5, Workstream 4, Page 31	A particular pre-feasibility study could span more than one project concept (e.g., strengthening of four 33/11 kV substations along with related feeders could be considered as one pre-feasibility study covering 4 project concepts). Please confirm if our understanding is correct, and confirm that the specific coverage of a particular pre-feasibility report will be subject to mutual discussions and agreement with ISA/GoR.	As per the RFP



145	Section 5, Workstream 5, Page 32	We understand that ISA will help us in reaching out to the concerned nodal person in the relevant department to provide the available sector-wise energy consumption and programme performance data.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
146	Section 5, Workstream 5, Page 32	We request ISA to kindly confirm whether consumer-level, feeder-level, and segment-wise datasets will be made available by the concerned DISCOMs for the purpose of this assessment.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
147	Section 5, Workstream 5, Page 32	We understand that the consultant is not expected to collect energy-use patterns from field-level installations, and that the consultant will be provided baseline data from respective utilities through the nodal department/person. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
148	Section 5, Workstream 5, Page 32	We also understand that the consultant is only expected to suggest and provide the framework of the required interventions, and not to offer programme management or implementation assistance. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
149	Section 5, Workstream 6, Page 32	Organize stakeholder consultations, technical workshops and review meetings, and incorporate feedback from all stakeholders – how many	As per the RFP



		consultations, workshops, and review meetings are expected? Will these meetings be virtual/in-person/hybrid?	
150	Section 5, Workstream 6, Page 32	We understand that three Institutional Capacity-Building workshops are to be held (in Aug 2026, Jan 2027 and June 2027). The Consultant shall be responsible only for arranging the workshop venue for 2 days and training material for the participants; all other incidental expenses for the participants/officials (e.g. TA, DA, accommodation) shall not be the responsibility of the consultant. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
151	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Page 32–33 & Payment Terms, Page 35	Please clarify whether the project coordinator is expected to be full-time or part-time, whether the role must be based in Jaipur or elsewhere in Rajasthan, and whether the coordinator must be proposed as named Key Personnel.	As per the RFP
153	Section 5, Role of the Agency, Page 33	Please confirm whether the consulting agency may select the modelling tool or tools based on its professional judgement, or whether ISA/GoR requires a preferred platform to ensure consistency with existing state planning frameworks.	As per Section 5 of the RFP, Page 33, the Agency may use any suitable platform for simulations and load flow analysis, provided that the selected tools ensure adequate accuracy and comply with applicable cybersecurity and data privacy requirements of CEA, CERC, Government of Rajasthan, and other relevant authorities.
154	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Pages 32–33	Would a 'nodal agency' and Point of Contact (PoC) be appointed to facilitate and drive coordination among various GoR entities?	As per the RFP
155	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Pages 32–33	Will ISA and the Energy Department designate nodal officers across key stakeholder organisations (Energy Department, RVPN, RRECL, SLDC and DISCOMs) and facilitate access to required data, consultations and review workshops throughout the engagement?	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information



			through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
156	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Pages 32–33	Would a project Steering Structure/Committee be appointed to facilitate efficient implementation?	As per the RFP
157	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Pages 32–33	It is requested to elaborate on the implementation support/activities envisaged from ISA/GoR under the institutional arrangement.	As per the RFP, ISA/GoR support includes policy direction, inter-agency coordination, data access, deliverable review and validation of assumptions.
158	Section 5, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements, Pages 32–33	Comprehensive access to all required datasets (transmission, renewable energy, demand, distribution, operational and planning information) is stated to be provided for modelling and analysis – will ISA/Energy Department designate nodal officers and facilitate access to required data, consultations and review workshops throughout the engagement? [See also Major 34, Row 4]	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
159	Section 5, Para 1.1, Page 27 & Indicative Timeline and Milestones, Page 34	Can ISA/GoR share (or confirm at inception) a workstream-level breakup of the milestone schedule, specifically identifying interim due dates for Workstream 1's Generation-Storage Capacity Strategy and Flexibility/Storage Integration Strategy, so these can be sequenced correctly against Workstream 2's network analysis (which depends on Workstream 1's generation-mix scenarios as an input)?	A detailed workstream-level milestone breakdown will be developed and agreed with the selected agency at inception, documented in the work plan.
160	Section 5, Indicative Timeline and Milestones, Page 34	The timeline references a 'July 2026' kick-off (evaluation and onboarding of technical agency, inception report and project kick-off),	Actual commencement will be updated from the date of contract execution, with the 12-month duration maintained.



		preceding the RFP issue date (31.07.2026) and submission deadline (21.08.2026). Please clarify this inconsistency.	
161	Section 5, Payment Terms, Page 35	The timeline for each of the payment milestones is missing. Please confirm/provide the timeline associated with each payment milestone.	As per the RFP.
162	Section 5, Payment Terms – Milestone 2, Page 35	We understand that the required data shall be provided to the Consultant by a single point of contact appointed by ISA/Energy Department within a stipulated timeline. Please clarify the process for timeline adjustment in case of delays attributable to data non-availability.	While relevant, publicly shareable data from designated government departments can be provided, ensuring the overall adequacy of data required to execute the RFP deliverables remains the sole responsibility of the agency. In the event of data unavailability, the bidder must proactively collect necessary information through alternative methods and establish benchmarks via stakeholder consultations to meet the established project timelines.
163	Section 5, Payment Terms – Milestone 1 (Inception Report), Page 35	Please specify the maximum time ISA/GoR will take to approve a submission or provide consolidated feedback. Please also confirm whether the liquidated-damages period will be suspended during any delay in ISA/GoR's approval or feedback.	As per the RFP
164	Section 6, Form D: Qualification Form, Page 36, 40 & 41	It is assumed that in the case of a consortium, either partner can satisfy the qualification requirements. Please confirm.	As per the RFP
165	General / EOI Reference: EOI No. 1/ISA-MDTF/2025-ISA	We submitted its formal response to the EOI on 05 October 2025 and sent multiple follow-up communications, but no status update or feedback was provided. Kindly share the evaluation outcome/scores of the EOI process and the list of participating/shortlisted bidders.	The EOI dated 05 October 2026 is separate from this RFP. EOI evaluation outcomes and scores are not disclosed, and EOI participation is not a prerequisite for this RFP.
166	General / EOI Reference: EOI No. 1/ISA-MDTF/2025-ISA	Please clarify if bidders are permitted to modify/update their proposed consortium structures, personnel, or financial approaches in this RFP relative to their earlier EOI response.	As per the RFP



167	General / Governance Matrix	Please provide a comprehensive list of all government, institutional, and donor stakeholders involved in decision-making throughout the assignment, to help the consultant design an effective stakeholder-management, consultation, and data-gathering strategy.	As per the RFP
168	General / MDTF Approval Workflow	As this project is funded under the MDTF framework, please clarify the exact multi-tier approval matrix and governance workflow for interim and final deliverables: who holds the final sign-off authority for technical milestone sign-off (e.g., State Steering Committee headed by Energy Secretary vs. ISA MDTF Technical Committee)? What are the stipulated turnaround times for client/donor review and approval at each stage?	As per the RFP
169	General / Procurement Practices	In the interest of fair play and transparent procurement practices, request ISA to make the anonymised (masked) pre-bid queries and ISA's responses of all participating bidders publicly available/shared with all bidders via email/portal.	The consolidated and anonymised pre-bid queries, together with ISA's responses thereto, shall be made available through the official corrigendum on ISA website.
170	General / Pre-Bid Meeting / Procurement Process	We would appreciate receiving the minutes of the pre-bid meeting, once available.	For any documentation related to this RFP process, please visit relevant corrigendum on ISA procurement webpage.

MDTF Procurement Unit
International Solar Alliance