

Mr. Antonino T. Aquino, President, Manila Water Company Inc., MWSS Admin Bldg., Katipunan Road 1105 Balara, Quezon City, Philippines, Phone: 632-981-8162, Fax: 632-981-8164

B: Philippines: Wastewater Treatment Systems and Facility Upgrades for Commercial Users Feasibility Study

POC Evangela Kunene, USTDA, 1000 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1600, Arlington, VA 22209-3901, Tel: (703) 875-4357, Fax: (703) 875-4009. Philippines: Wastewater Treatment Systems and Facility Upgrades for Commercial Users Feasibility Study. Reference is made to the September 29, 2008 amendment and September 10, 2008 announcement, solicitation number 0831033A, inviting questions from offerors who will submit qualifications and proposal data to develop a feasibility study to investigate onsite wastewater treatment options and/or technology upgrades for four treatment facilities to provide wastewater treatment services to commercial and industrial customers in metro Manila, Philippines.

The Grantee (“MWCI”) would like to amend the RFP and provide a new proposal delivery address. All proposals should be delivered to the bid box at the Manila Water Office no later than 4:00PM Philippine LOCAL TIME, on October 24, 2008. If using postal mail service or courier, the offeror should ensure that the delivery arrives on or before the deadline set here and in the RFP. The addressee and place of delivery for all proposals is:

To: Mr. Antonino T. Aquino, President
Thru: Ms. Marilou G. Bago, Sr. Manager – Logistics / Ms. Lyn Almario –
Department Manager, Sustainable Development

Finance Department, 2nd Floor, MWSS Administration Bldg
Katipunan Road, 1105 Balara, Quezon City
Metro Manila, Philippines

Below are the list of questions that were received and the corresponding responses.

Question 1.

Section J1. Qualifications, page 20, lists the suggested selection criteria. Is this the criteria to be used by the MWCI selection committee? Number 3 lists 5 experts with 5 points each for a total of 25 points. Can this be interpreted that the Team Leader is the same value as the electrical engineer?

Answer 1.

Refer to Sections 2.3 and 4 of the RFP. The Definitional Mission report is provided for background information only. The RFP Award Criteria lists the maximum points given for each member of the project team as the same, in this case 5 points, regardless of the function.

Question 2.

Section J1. Does point structure make it mandatory that the bidders bid staff as presented? Would MWCI consider modifying the points structure if different experts were bid based on our opinion of best completing the FS? For instance, there are 17 days for an electrical engineer and 32 days for a mechanical engineer. For this type of FS, these inputs do not appear to be needed. Manufacturers can provide needed data and local engineers can assist with local field surveys.

Answer 2.

The Definitional Mission report is provided for background information only. Refer to Sections 2.3 and 4 of the RFP. The key personnel specified in Section 4 of the RFP are the mandatory requirements for the project based on Manila Water's assessment. Bidders, may propose an alternative and/or additional functions apart from those specified in the RFP, providing a justification. Please note that USTDA's grant funding is provided on a fixed price basis only. The addition of functions will be considered by MWCI during the review of proposals and evaluated by following this formula:

$$\text{Points} = (\text{number of valid functions} / \text{total proposed functions}) \times 25$$

Question 3.

Section J1 and Appendix L1. There are no points in J1.3. for the Scientist/Auto/Cad and Sponsor Liaison listed in Appendix L1. Are these intended to be all local staff? Are they staff of MWCI? And if so, are their names and positions available? What are their rates?

Answer 3

The Definitional Mission report is provided for background information only. Refer to Sections 2.3, 2.20 and 4 of the RFP. It is the responsibility of the offeror to identify and propose an appropriate team to complete the full Terms of Reference in Annex 4 and 5.

Question 4.

Appendix L1. If the sponsor liaison is not MWCI, then can MWCI advise who is appropriate? Maybe they can select a local team(s) and supply the name(s) to all the bidders?

Answer 4.

The Definitional Mission report is provided for background information only. Refer to Sections 2.3 and 2.20 of the RFP. Appendix L1 in the report was a budget estimate used by USTDA in order to establish the fixed price value of the grant amount. It is the responsibility of the offeror to identify and hire any local team members/subcontractors.

Question 5.

Appendix LI – TOR. Is there any information on the industrial/commercial dischargers('traders)? A summary of their business, discharges, amount of pre-treatment, locations? Does DENR have this information and does MWCI have access to it?

Answer 5.

The Definitional Mission report is provided for background information only. Refer to Section 2.3, Annex 4 and 5 in the RFP. The Terms of Reference are found in Annex 4 and 5 of the RFP, not in the Definitional Mission report.

The information requested will be provided to the selected Contractor, following contract signing, for purposes of conducting the feasibility study. There is publicly available information online. MWCI encourages offerors to use public resources, as they see fit, in preparing their proposal.

Question 6.

Is there any further information on the existing WWT facilities operated by MWCI?

Answer 6.

This information will be provided to the selected Contractor, following contract signing, for purposes of conducting the feasibility study. The Terms of Reference in Annex 4 and 5 provide sufficient information for the purposes of submitting a proposal. There is also publicly available information online.

Question 7.

Regarding the following statement, on page 1 of the TOR, “The Contractor shall identify onsite wastewater treatment systems for 6 individual, different types of commercial customers, and the Grantee shall identify the 6 customers to be considered.” Can MWCI provide a general description of the end product of the various types of commercial customers? Are the commercial users major industries or small scale “cottage” type industries?

Answer 7.

Greater detail and specific information will be provided to the selected Contractor, following contract signing, for purposes of conducting the feasibility study. This information is not needed for purposes of submitting a proposal to conduct the feasibility study.

Generally speaking, most of the current non-domestic customers are retail and restaurant businesses. Smaller and medium scale enterprises (“cottage”) are found most often in domestic households and thus contribute to what is classified as “domestic” sewage. Heavy industry wastewater is treated by the industries themselves to comply with government effluent discharge standards; however there is the possibility that future expansion of sewer network effluents from heavy industries, treated or partially treated, may be sent to MWCI plants, particularly in light of the current strategy of combined sewer systems. The Clean Water Act details pre-treatment standards that MWCI, as the concessionaire, may implement ‘by contract’ in the absence of guidelines from DENR.

Question 8.

Page 1, paragraph 2 of the TOR states, “the Study will identify necessary... wastewater treatment technology for wastewater conditioning for reuse.” Could you please clarify if this analysis will be done for each of the 4 existing wastewater treatment facilities or, as

is referred to on page 26 of the DM, the analysis will only be needed for “one currently planned wastewater facility?”

Answer 8.

Refer to Annex 4 and 5 of the RFP. The Terms of Reference in the Grant Agreement detail the required work to be performed as part of the feasibility study. The DM report is background information only as detailed in Section 2.3 of the RFP.

Only one reuse analysis will be required. This assumes that all effluent will have the same characteristics, regardless of the inflow parameters.

Question 9.

Page 15 of the RFP (Section 4), #1, states that part of the award criteria will be based on “1.2 Offeror’s overseas experience: 10 points”. Does overseas refer specifically to work in the Philippines or just work outside of the U.S.?

Answer 9.

The Grantee will use the following point valuation, 10 being the maximum possible points awarded. For Offerors that do not have experience in the Philippines, the Grantee will add accumulated experience based on the following:

Experience in Southeast Asia	5 points
Experience in the Philippines	10 points

Total possible points: 10 points

Question 10.

Page 15 of the RFP (Section 4), # 3, gives a list of 5 discipline titles. Is the Offeror allowed to propose a project team with greater or fewer than 5 people? In addition, can 1 person fulfill two roles?

Answer 10.

MWCI will require at least one dedicated person for each role.

Question 11.

Page 12, paragraph 1 of the DM lists water quality standards of 50 ppm BOD and 75 ppm TSS. Are these standards the current standards for industry throughout the service area? In addition, will these be the requirements for effluent discharged *to* the existing wastewater treatment facilities, or for effluent discharged *from* the existing wastewater treatment facilities into open waterways?

Answer 11.

The DENR DAO 35 effluent discharge standards for Class C water is as follows:

Parameter	Maximum Allowable
BOD5	50 mg/L
COD	100 mg/L
TSS	70 mg/L
Oil & Grease	5 mg/L
Total Coliforms	10,000 MPN/100 mL

These are for effluent discharge into receiving bodies of water.

The Clean Water Act provides pre-treatment standards for non-domestic wastewater generators before they can discharge to the sewer systems they are connected to. However, the allowable levels are not yet defined by DENR. MWCI is currently drafting its own pre-treatment standards, relying heavily on the quality standards for domestic wastewater which was used as the design criteria for the existing wastewater treatment facilities.

Question 12.

Is there any shotcrete (gunite or pneumatically applied concrete), pressure grout of SewperCoat involved in this project?

Answer 12.

This RFP is in reference to a feasibility study that will recommend several technology and equipment options for MWCI business objectives. No material is being procured or specified at this stage.