



**Q&A + Erratum - dated 18/07/2025**  
**concerning public service contract No. MOZ22005-10079 “Evaluation and preparation of  
renewable energy strategy and strategy for conservation and sustainable use of biomass energy”**

**ERRATUM:** Please note that there is a contradiction in the tender documents regarding the required references. Section 3.4.2 states that *“two (2) similar services performed in the last three (3) years”* are required, whereas Section 6.9 indicates *“five (5) similar services performed in the last seven (7) years.”* The correct requirement is the one indicated in Section 3.4.2: two (2) similar services performed in the last three (3) years.

**NOTE:** the deadline has been extended to 11 August 2025 at 12 PM (noon).

N°	Question	Answer
1.	<p>Firstly, while the tender document specifies that the offer must be submitted by courier to Mozambique, we note that in Section 3.3.3 (page 13), the penultimate sentence states: <i>"Only offers received within the deadline will be considered, therefore it is the tenderer's responsibility to ensure that the electronic offers are sent in due time."</i> This wording appears to suggest that electronic submission may be permissible. Could you kindly confirm whether submission via electronic means is acceptable prior to the deadline, and if hard copies are only required upon award of the contract?</p>	<p>There is a mistake in the wording. Only hard copies are acceptable before the deadline. The original copy of the completed tender will be submitted on paper. One digital copy will be submitted in one or more PDF files on a USB stick. The paper copy and the USB stick are to be submitted in a properly sealed envelope bearing the following information: <b><i>Tender MOZ2205-10079</i></b></p> <p>It may be submitted:</p> <p>By <b>courier</b> (standard mail or registered mail). In this case, the sealed envelope is put in a second closed envelope addressed to: <i>Enabel Mozambique, public-law company, Av. Kenneth Kaunda 267, Maputo, Mozambique</i></p> <p>Or</p> <p><b>Delivered by hand</b> with acknowledgement of receipt. The service can be reached on working days during office hours, from 8:00 to 17:00 (East African Time).</p>
2.	<p>Secondly, regarding the language requirements: we understand that the offer must be submitted in either English or Portuguese. However, certain legal certificates we are required to attach—such as company registration or fiscal status documents—are only officially issued in the national languages of Belgium (Dutch and French). Would the original versions of these documents suffice, or would you advise submitting (free) translations in English alongside the originals for clarity?</p>	<p>Official documents can be submitted in Portuguese, English, or one of Belgium's official language (Dutch or French).</p>

3.	What is the expected level of involvement from MIREME and other local stakeholders (ARENE, EDM...) during both Phase 1 (Evaluation) and Phase 2 (Update)? Will Enabel or MIREME facilitate access to key stakeholders and official documents?	MIREME will provide the consultants with an official credential. The consultants are responsible for setting up the stakeholder consultation meetings. If there is a specific difficulty in accessing a particular stakeholder MIREME, can interact directly with that stakeholder to facilitate the meeting. However, this will only be done in extraordinary circumstances. In this cases MIREME will require to be cc in the communications.
4.	Are there any specific challenges or gaps already identified by Enabel in the current EDENR and BEST strategies that the consultancy should prioritize?	No, the consultants should identify these. If they don't have access to the current consultancies, we can facilitate access to this information
5.	Is there a preference or requirement for alignment with specific international frameworks (Paris Agreement, AU Agenda 2063)?	Yes, there is. Both documents mentioned are applicable. However, national frameworks are priority.
6.	Is there an expected scope of remote vs. in-country activities, especially given the importance of stakeholder engagement in Maputo?	Yes. Please see the TOR's section indicating preference for in-country and remote work. Consultants should do their best to address this preference.
7.	Are there any taxes or deductions that non-resident contractors should be especially aware of beyond the standard withholding tax? (e.g., VAT implications or local income taxes)	If the company doesn't have a residency in Mozambique the applicable tax they should consider is the withholding tax (20% on all income earned within Mozambican territory by non-resident, withholding at source). In some cases, we can consider another rate via a double taxation agreement between the country of residence and Mozambique.

8.	Given that our headquarters are located in Berlin, we will have to send our proposal per post-mail, our parcel delivery service requires a Postal Code or Zip Code to complete the address and this information is not available online. Would it be possible for you to share this information?	The Postal Code is 1100.
9.	<p>There are discrepancies between the address registered on the ToRs and the one given on the questionnaire, please confirm which one is the correct one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On ToRs: Enabel in Mozambique, Av. Kenneth Kaunda, 264, Maputo, Mozambique</li> <li>On Questionnaire: Enabel Mozambique, public-law company, Av. Kenneth Kaunda 267, Maputo, Mozambique</li> </ul>	The official address is Av. Kenneth Kaunda <b>264</b> , Maputo, Mozambique.
10.	Signature of Consortium members: according to ToRs section 3.3.3, we do understand that if the tenderer takes the option to establish a consortium with one or more companies, the tender will have to sign by each of these companies. However, if instead the tenderer takes the option only to subcontract either companies or/and individual experts, will it be also mandatory for these subcontracted to sign the tenders?	<p>In case of consortium, every partner entity must fill in the identification form. The identification form must be signed by the authorized mandatory of the entity.</p> <p>In case of subcontracting, every subcontractor must fill in and sign the Third-party capacity – Forma engagement (optional) in annex.</p>
11.	Performance bond: is the performance bond mandatory for all tenderers or just for the winner? Providing it will be applicable only to the winner, exactly in what contract phase is this performance bond required to be constituted? Besides, what will be the evaluation criteria ENABEL uses for eventual executions of such performance bond?	The performance bond must be constituted only by the successful tenderer after awarding (to guarantee good performance of the tender)
12.	<p>Presential meetings required either by MIREME or ENABEL: ToRs, in its page 25, defines de following: <b>“Remote Work: Activities such as desk reviews, data analysis, report drafting, and presentation preparation can be conducted remotely. However, the tenderer must ensure seamless communication and availability for meetings (virtual or in-person as required) with MIREME and Enabel.”</b></p> <p>As we understand this requirement, the tenderer might be required to randomly be present in any presential meeting required by MIREME/ENABEL, during the execution of the Works, without an anticipated knowledge of meetings schedule/calendar (in fact, ToRs define no meetings calendar), and without knowing what level of tenderer team members will be required to be present. Obviously,</p>	The understanding appears to be incorrect. What we require during the remote work phase is that all team members be available online for meetings. However, for consultations with stakeholders, we strongly encourage the consultant to ensure the presence of a local team member. Additionally, during the workshops, we strongly encourage the physical presence of the team leader. The only non-negotiable requirement is that the consultant must guarantee appropriate communication equipment and conditions for all team members participating in online meetings.

	<p>this would not be a problem if for any one of these meetings, required for example for a period where the Team Leader might be out of Mozambique, MIREME/ENABEL accepts for the tendered to be present by its local expert partner. However, and independently of the fact we are programming to have a strong presence in Mozambique, if the presential requirements for such meetings are for other team members besides the local expert member, we might have here uncontrolled costs as the required member would have to accept to schedule unexpected trips to Maputo, with the related unexpected costs. In this case, if this kind of requirement happens often, we would be occurring here in an important financial risk (meaning budget deviation). As such, the only way for us to avoid this risk would be for the tenderer to have present in Mozambique, in continuous, a team member besides the local expert member, namely its Team Leader. But, this arrangement would substantially (and unnecessarily) increase the price of our financial proposal, making it probably uncompetitive. Consequently, our question on this subject is: Would it be acceptable for the tenderer assistance to such unscheduled meetings to be guaranteed by the local expert partner, whenever they might occur in periods of time where no other Team member is in Mozambique?</p>	
13.	<p>Selection criteria: in section 3.4.2, page 15/55, ENABEL apparently raises the possibility to request to tenderers the possibility to request some additional company accounting details: <i>“the tenderer must prove that he is sufficiently capable, from an economic, financial, and technical point of view, to successfully perform this public procurement contract.”</i>. We found this eventual request in no other ToRs place, and the only other financial request we found was in Form 6.2, Financial Identification, where ENABEL is requesting bank details from the tenderer (which is quite normal) but requesting no other tenderer accounting data. Consequently, we are confused about the section 3.4.2. suggestion of request. Therefore, we kindly request an ENABEL clarification on this matter: is ENABEL going to request to tenderers any accounting data besides the Form 6.2 strict financial identification? Providing ENABEL shall request additional accounting data, exactly what kind of data shall be requested, and if there will be any kind of accounting threshold tenderers will be required to accomplish. Please understand that such information will be crucial to tenderers, as according to your requirements, tenderers organization might have to be adapted accordingly.</p>	<p>Regarding the selection criteria, the tenderer must provide only the requested elements under point 3.4.2: 1) references + 2) Proposed team to tender the contract + ESPD document (bids without the ESPD document signed by hand will be rejected).</p> <p>Regarding accounting data, ENABEL is NOT going to request to tenderers any accounting data besides the Form 6.2 financial identification.</p>

14.	<p>Work plan: we made a preliminary draft attempt of a work plan strictly adapted and respecting ENABEL requirements, as it can be seen below, but still we are finding discrepancies/contradictions, and consequently we are having difficulties to produce a work plan final version to propose. In fact, we have the following doubts that we would like ENABEL to clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Phase 1 and 2 duration: ToRs mention such phases should take approximately (and respectively) 25 to 28 weeks and 35 to 38 weeks. In our quite preliminary work plan below, we considered respectively 27 and 40 weeks, for a total of 67 weeks, meaning approximately 15,4 months</li> <li>2. On the other hand, ToRs mention in its section 2.4 that <i>“the overall contract will remain valid for up to <b>22 months</b> from the initial contract award notification”</i>;</li> <li>3. This means, in our reasoning, we have somehow to accommodate 22 – 15,4 months = 6,6 months for other activities besides strict consultant working activities;</li> <li>4. Going ahead, ToRs also mention in its section 2.4, Phase 2 that: <i>“An additional period of approximately <b>6 weeks</b> is anticipated for the Government's formal approval process of the updated strategies, during which the tenderer will provide support as needed”</i></li> <li>5. And, in page 38/55, section Phase 2.6: <i>“This approval process is expected to take approximately <b>6 weeks</b> after submission of the final updated strategies. However, this timeline may vary depending on government procedures. The tenderer will remain available to provide support as needed during this period”</i></li> <li>6. In practical terms, this means we have in your proposed ToRs time schedule 2 totally different periods that we don't control, and whose duration ENABEL doesn't guarantee;</li> <li>7. Consequently, we think we should have some kind of a previous ENABEL agreement/guidance on the way we organize the work plan we will propose you;</li> <li>8. As such, at the below attached quite preliminary work plan we considered the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.1. Period for ENABEL to get Government's formal approval for the updated strategies: <b>14 weeks (3,21 months) on the contrary of the uncertain 6 weeks mentioned by ENABEL;</b></li> <li>8.2. Period required by ENABEL for submission of the final updated strategies: <b>13 weeks (2,98 months) on the contrary of the uncertain 6 weeks mentioned by ENABEL;</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Answer to point 3: no, that is not the correct interpretation. Should you be able to complete the assignment within 15.4 months, it would be highly appreciated. The overall contract duration of 22 months has been established to provide a margin, ensuring that no contract amendment is necessary in the event of unforeseen delays.</p> <p>Answer to point 7: the Government approval process in phase 2.6 will most likely be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Presentation of the strategies to the director level of the MIRME</li> <li>2- Presentation of the strategies to the Ministry</li> <li>3- Presentation of the strategies to the council of Ministers</li> </ol> <p>At each of these stages, feedback will be provided, and the consultants will be expected to integrate the comments and recommendations received from these hierarchical levels. While it is difficult to estimate the extent of the feedback at this stage, we believe that if stakeholder consultations are conducted thoroughly and effectively, the level of required adjustments should be limited.</p> <p>Answer to point 8.2: the consultant is free to propose a detailed and extended timeline for the approval process. However, these will be considered as non-binding suggestions. It is our understanding that the Government considers the update of the strategies a high priority. While we acknowledge that additional time may be required for Phase 2.6, we do not foresee the need for an additional 14 weeks for Phase 2.5.</p>
-----	--	--

	<p>9. Organizing the workplan this way, we would have a total contract duration of 22 months, as ENABEL is requesting. However, this is just our understanding of how these ENABEL not guaranteed periods could be managed (obviously not the only one), and we fully understand that we might be wrong in our preliminary reasoning, and that ENABEL is in fact seeking a different approach for a final work plan. If so, we kindly request now for ENABEL to clarify if our reasoning is acceptable, but if not, what shall be the premises we need to change related to the duration of these 2 non-guaranteed (duration) periods.</p>	
15.	<p>According to ToRs, we have to fill and deliver the following Forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6.1 Legal entity</li> <li>• 6.2 Financial identification</li> <li>• 6.3 Declaration on honour – exclusion criteria</li> <li>• 6.4 Integrity statement for the tenderers</li> <li>• 6.5 Power of attorney</li> <li>• 6.6 Certification of registration and / or legal status</li> <li>• 6.7 Certification of clearance with regards to the payments of social security contributions</li> <li>• 6.8 Certification of clearance with regards to the payments of applicable taxes</li> <li>• 6.9 References of similar services</li> <li>• 6.10 Financial offer &amp; tender form</li> </ul> <p>Our doubts on this subject are related to the way you might request for these Forms to be presented, if separated from Technical and Financial proposals (for example in a set of pdf docs called “Forms”), if integrated in one of those 2 proposals (or in both)? For example, Forms 6.2 and 6.10 are usually included as a part of our standard Financial proposals. On the other hand, for example Form 6.9 is usually integrated in our standard Technical proposals. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The list of documents you mentioned is incorrect, as it does not correspond to the list provided in the tender documents. Please refer to the list below, which reflects the requirements as stated in the tender.</p> <p><b>3.3.1 Data to be included in the tender</b></p> <p>The tender of the tenderer will consist of the physically separate sections mentioned below (see point 6 “Forms”):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Form 6.1: Identification form;</li> <li>2. Form 6.2: Financial identification;</li> <li>3. Form 6.3: Declaration on honour – exclusion criteria;</li> <li>4. Form 6.4: Integrity statement for the tenderer;</li> <li>5. Power of Attorney;</li> <li>6. Updated certification of registration</li> <li>7. The document certifying that the tenderer is in order with the payment of social contributions;</li> <li>8. The document certifying that the tenderer is in order with the payment of taxes.</li> <li>9. Form 6.9: List of the main similar services and certificates associated.</li> <li>10. Form 6.10: Price form</li> <li>11. Technical offer;</li> <li>12. <b>ESPD document (Bid without ESPD document originally signed will be rejected!</b></li> </ol> <p>Kindly note that the tenderer is free to present the documents using their own structure, provided all required information is included.</p>
16.	<p>Apparently, there is a contradiction on the required references, as section 3.4.2 requires “two (2) similar services performed in the last three (3) years”, and section 6.9 requires “five (5) similar services performed in the last seven (7) years”. The question here is: which section should we consider?</p>	<p>Indeed, there was an error. The correct requirement is: <b>“Two (2) similar services performed within the last three (3) years.”</b></p>

17.	<p>References: providing the tenderer takes the option only to subcontract companies and/or individual experts, but a substantial part of the required references belong to these subcontracted entities, will their references be accepted as valid tenderer references?</p>	<p>Yes, references from subcontracted entities can be accepted as long as these subcontracted entities sign the form “Third-party capacity – Forma engagement (optional)” (in annex).</p>
18.	<p>Our courier service requires the provision of a contact person at the delivery address to ensure proper receipt and signature upon delivery. In the tender specifications, I could only identify <i>Enabel in Mozambique</i> as the recipient entity.</p> <p>Could you kindly provide us with the name of a contact person, as well as a local telephone number? This information is necessary to facilitate the courier process.</p>	<p>Juliette Campogrande, <a href="mailto:juliette.campogrande@enabel.be">juliette.campogrande@enabel.be</a>, +258 85 211 77 53</p>
19.	<p>Would ENABEL accept the complete set of docs with digitalized signatures from the European partners, with the tender signed by hand only by our local partner and representant in Maputo, with the right power of attorney?</p>	<p>We understand the practical difficulties involved; however, the requirement for original signatures on all these documents from each partner is mandatory under the applicable legal framework. If digital signatures from European partners hold recognized legal value, this may be considered a valid alternative. In such a case, it is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure the legal validity and compliance of the digital signatures submitted.</p>
20.	<p>As we wish to establish a partnership, most probably a consortium between two different companies, for now designated by A and B, being A the company that shall assume the leadership of the consortium,</p> <p>Besides de tender, as defined in section 3.3.3. of the ToRs, exactly what other documents will have to be signed together by companies A and B?</p> <p>Will it be required for company B, also to present independent signed FORMS, as specifically for cases of FORMS 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, and ESPD, or instead such documents shall only have to be presented by the company A as consortium leader?</p> <p>At this stage, will it be required for us to present any document defining the type of association we shall establish, or for now will be enough in both proposals (Technical and Economic) to present cover letters declaring the will to establish such partnership?</p>	<p>An original partnership agreement between the consortium partners must be included in the bid. In this document, the partners may designate one of them as the legal representative of the consortium, granting them the mandate to sign all documents related to the bid on behalf of the consortium.</p>



21.	<p>Taking in consideration TS MOZ22005-10079 title is “Evaluation and preparation of renewable energy strategy and strategy for conservation and sustainable use of biomass energy”, and that in ToRs we found no other specific reference to other RES (Renewable Energy Source), at least specifically and directly connected with biomass conservation and sustainable use, should we consider the necessity to perform an EDENR status confirmation (Phase 1) and upgrade (Phase 2), exclusively limited to the biomass component, or instead should we consider Phases 1 and 2 should include the complete EDENR?</p>	<p>These are two different strategies. Phase 1 and Phase 2 are applicable to the two different strategies. You can find the one of the strategies here <a href="#">EUEI 2012 NOV Estrategia de Energia de Biomassa Mocambique Esboço versao curta.pdf</a> and the other here <a href="#">PT-Estrategias de Desenvolvimento de E. Novas e Renovaveis-Ministerio da Energia.pdf</a></p> <p>Unfortunately we don't have the strategies in English version.</p>
22.	<p>We are collaborating with subcontractors from another continent. We would like to ask whether it is permissible to include scanned copies, properly signed in blue ink, of the required documents with the tender submission — with the original signed documents to follow by courier, at a later date?</p>	<p>The documents only need to be duly signed with an original handwritten signature by the tenderer. There is no requirement for them to be signed by the subcontractors.</p>



