Clarification in respect of pre-bid meeting of RfP for IRMA under AMRUT held on 25.05.2018

| SI. No | Clause No. of RFP/ Page number | RFP/ ge umber | | Clarification |
|-----------|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Section-2, Page 11 of 90 | Part I: The consultant will be required to establish at least one office within the geographical limit of the cluster for which it has been selected (Example: The consultant selected for Haryana cluster shall establish at least one office in any of the three States/UT in that cluster namely Haryana, NCT of Delhi and Uttarakhand). Consultant will be paid 5% of total cost of services for each State calculated on pro-rata basis from the agreed fee for the cluster as mobilization advance at the time of on-boarding after having set up office and putting the team in place and on certification by the State Mission Director of the State/UT in the cluster where the office has been set up. | As per consultant view 5% amount will be paid to the consultant as a mobilization. Please clarify the pro rata basis calculation | This clause is amply clarified in RfP |
| 2 | Section-2, Page 12 of 90 | c) The consultant will claim the payment on quarterly basis in respect of the visits made in the immediately preceding quarter. | Please clarify the stage of Site visits and payment. | Payment terms and conditions are well defined in RfP. |

| 3 | Section-2, Page 12 of 90 | Part IV: For each project, the final 10 % of the payment shall be paid on submission and acceptance of the overall assessment report assessing the performance of the asset created and service levels. This amount will be calculated as above in Part-III where in value of 'p' will be 10% of total fee for entire scope of work accepted for a particular cluster. This visit will be one year after the commissioning of the project. | As per consultant view the staff will be deployed at site office one more year after finish of project in three year. Please clarify. | Clearly explained in RfP |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Section-2, Page 34 of 90 | All projects will be periodically monitored and reviewed by Apex Committee and will be subjected to various audits by external and empaneled agencies, internal auditors as well as by C&AG and State AGs. | As per consultant view, it is not necessary to empanel in AMRUT for bidding. Please clarify | Empanelment is not required for bidding. |
| 5 | Section-5, Page 35of 90 | IRMAs shall be appointed for a period of three years. Extension of work of IRMA beyond this period shall be subject to the recommendation of the concerned SLTC and approval of the Apex Committee and will be for a period of one year at a time up to a maximum of two extensions. | As per consultant view, the project will finish in three year. Please clarify the payment calculation for extension of work | Payment calculation is clearly brought out in RfP |
| 6 | Section-5, Page 35 of 90 | For a particular project, the IRMA's work starts from the date of approval of the DPR from SLTC and ends one year after the filing of Project | Please clarify the quantum and Scope of work. | Scope of work is well defined in RfP. |

| | | Completion Report. Subsequent to filing of the Project Completion Report, the IRMA shall make one visit after one year of such milestone to assess the overall performance of the asset created and improvement in Service levels as per the Scope of Work defined in this document. | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7 | Clause 21 (b) Part I on Page 11 | Clause 21(b) Part I mentions that "The consultant will be required to establish at least one office within the geographical limit of the cluster for which it has been selected". Please clarify whether the office has to be set up in anyone of the state within a cluster or in all states in a cluster. | If only one office has to be set up in a cluster (having more than one state), then the Consultant will decide at its own discretion in which state the office is to be set up within the state. Please clarify. | Selection of State for the purpose of establish of office is at the discretion of the selected agency for respective cluster. |
| 8 | Clause 21 (b) Part III and IV | | Please clarify that in total 6 visits and 1 visit are required per city , for getting the full payment in Clause 21 (b) Part III and IV respectively, even if some projects are delayed or there can be more visits as well. Clarity is required as the RFP mentions that travel expenses will not be reimbursed by the Employer and therefore will have to be included in the financial quote. | It is amply clarified in RfP. |
| 9 | Clause 21 (b) Part III | | It is requested that "q" should be either "cost of DPR approved by SHPSC" or "actual | No change in original clause. |

| | | awarded cost of project" and not lower of the | |
|----|--|---|--|
| | | two. | |
| 10 | Clause 3(v) of TOR on Page 35 | Clause 3(v) of TOR mentions that "For a particular project, the IRMA's work starts from the date of approval of the DPR from SLTC and ends one year after the filing of Project Completion Report". IRMAs will be appointed for a period of three years as per RFP, so if some projects get delayed and the work extends beyond three years then how will IRMA be compensated? | Payment clause is self-explanatory.No change in original clause. |
| 11 | Clause 10 of Part II Data Sheet on Page 16 | Please specify the minimum project cost of assignments required in Criteria 1 (b). Criteria 1 (b) mentions the assignments in "Urban sector". Can the bidder include assignments related to Affordable housing, Smart Cities, Metro Rail, Roads, Ports, Airports etc which are not the focus areas under AMRUT? Please specify which sectors in "Urban" are acceptable under Criteria 1 of Clause 10 of Part II Data Sheet | Urban is well known. No change in original clause. |
| 12 | Clause 10 of Part II Data Sheet on Page 16 and Form Tech-2 on Page 21,22 | Criteria 1(a) mentions minimum project cost as Rs 10 crore, but "Summary of Experience" table given on page 21 of RFP seeks details of "Value of consultancy provided by firm (in INR)". Should the bidder mention project cost in "Summary of Experience" table given on page 21 and in table included in "C-Consultant's Experience" for each assignment. Please clarify. | RfP is very clear and self-explanatory. No Change. |

| 13 | Clause 4 of TOR on Page 36 and Clause 10 of Part II Data Sheet on Page 18 | Whether a personnel having a total work experience of 10 years (in which he was Team Leader/ Deputy Team Leader for 2 years), be eligible? This is because Clause 4 of TOR mentions the Essential experience of Team leader as "Experience of minimum 10 years as Team Leader/ Deputy Team Leader in urban infrastructure projects" and Criteria 3 of Clause 10 on Page 18 mentions that "4 marks for 10 to 12 years experience". Please clarify. | clear. No further clarification is required |
|----|---|---|---|
| 14 | Form Tech 4 on Page 24 and Clause 10 of Part II Data Sheet on page 16,17,18 | Form Tech 4 seeks details related to technical approach and methodology, work plan, and organization and staffing schedule but no marks have been allocated in the evaluation criteria mentioned in Clause 1 0 of Part II Data Sheet. Please clarify | It is amply defined in RfP. |
| 15 | Clause 9.3(a) on Page 6 | Clause 9.3(a) mentions that "The estimated number of Professional staff-months for the Assignment/job is as shown in the Part II Data sheet" but the same is not clearly mentioned in Part II Data sheet, ToR of RFP. It is requested to mention the estimated number of man-months which will help the bidder to submit a competitive bid. | clause. |
| 16 | Clause 2.2 of TOR on Page 33 | Clause 2.2 of TOR mentions that "The AMRUT has been planned for a period of five years from FY 2015- 16 to FY 2019-20 initially" and Clause 3(iv) of TOR mentions "IRMAs shall be appointed for a period of three years" i.e. till year 2021. Please clarify. | It is sufficiently clarified in RfP. |

| 17 | Clause 4 of TOR on Page 36 | Clause 4 of TOR mentions that "If the consultant feels the need to deploy more personnel than proposed in the Technical Bid in form Tech-7 to meet the timelines as specified by the employer". | Please clarify that the Employer will pay additional compensation for this additional resource, if the same is required to be deployed to meet timelines as specified by employer. | No additional compensation is admissible. |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 18 | Clause 4 of TOR on Page 36,37 and Criteria 3 in Clause 10 of Data Sheet Part" II on page 18 | | CV should satisfy anyone condition or all three conditions given under Desirable condition in Clause 4 of TOR on Page 36, 37 for getting 1 mark. Please clarify. | Satisfying any one of the desirable conditions shall be eligibility criterion for scoring 1 mark. |
| 19 | Clause 10 of Data Sheet Part II on Page 18 | | It is requested to increase the minimum marks for technical eligibility from current 60 marks to 75 marks. | No change in original clause. |
| 20 | CI 21 (b), pg 12/90 | As in the tender: Cost of Project shall be lower of the cost of DPR approved by SHPSC and actual awarded cost of project. | This clause implies that the Consultant will never be paid 100% of their quoted fee. This condition introduces an element of uncertainty which cannot be quantified. Moreover, the Consultant's scope effort is quantified in terms of no. of visits; this remains unchanged even if some projects are awarded at a lesser cost or is not taken up at all. | No change in original clause. |
| 21 | Data sheet, CI 15.4, pg | As in the tender: The Ministry reserves the right to add | Please confirm fee for such additional projects will be over and above the fee | Payment terms are clearly defined in RfP |

| 22 | 18/90 | more projects from any other schemes or programmes or stand-alone projects for review and monitoring. | quoted by the Consultants in their Financial Bid. Would the additional projects be from the cluster which is awarded to the Consultant Please also inform how the additional fee will be decided. In case the bidder is putting in a bid for | Yes. It is clearly |
|----|---|--|---|---|
| 22 | - | General | more than one cluster, would they be required to submit different CVs in all bids? | mentioned in RfP. |
| 23 | ITB Clause Reference 15.4 Criteria-L, Point a and b | Past experience in planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation of urban infrastructure projects costing Rs.10 crore or above each, in the areas of water supply, sewerage/public health engineering, in India and/or abroad* in past 10 years preceding the proposal Experience in implementation / execution and monitoring / evaluation of projects in urban sector in past 10 years preceding the proposal submission date. (Up to 10 and 5 citations may be given in support of 'a' and 'b'. | What would be procedure of marking scheme in case no. of citations will be less than 10 and 5 in support of 'a' and 'b' respectively? Kindly explain. | Marking criteria is amply explained in RfP. |
| 24 | | Payment shall be paid on submission and acceptance of the overall assessment report assessing the performance of the asset Created and service levels. This amount will be calculated as above in Part-III where in value of 'p' will be 10% of total fee for entire scope of work accepted for a particular cluster. This visit will be one | If there are delays to commissioning of project, then payment will also be delayed. Request to reduce it to 5%. | No change in original clause. |

| | | year after the commissioning of the project. | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|
| 25 | Data sheet, CI 15.4, p 18/90 | As in the tender: The minimum technical score (St) required to Pass/qualify is: 60 (Sixty). | Please inform if there are any minimum marks for each sub criteria. | Marking system is clearly brought out in RfP. |
| 26 | Instruction to Bidders, Part II, Clause no. 10, Specific Experience of the Bidder, Page no. 16 | Past experience in planning, implementation and monitoring & evaluation of urban infrastructure projects costing Rs. 10 crore or above each, in the areas of water supply, sewerage/ public health engineering, in India and/or abroad' in past 10 years preceding the proposal Submission date. | We understood that the capital cost of the infrastructure projects should be more than Rs. 10 crore. Kindly Confirm" | Clearly defined in RfP. |
| 27 | Appendix A, Pre Construction Stage, i, b & c, Page no. 63 | Check extent of completion of design with respect to the committed service level improvement sanctioned in SLIP/SAAP. Review adherence to technical standards in the detailed execution designs / drawings prepared | We understood that the review & conformity of the design parameters w.r.t. SLIP shall not mean redesign and analysis of the components proposed under the project. Scope shall be limited to review and assure the standard para meters followed as per CPHEEO norms or standard design guidelines. Kindly confirm. | The scope of work shall be as defined in RfP. |
| 28 | Appendix A, Construction Stage, Page na.64 | Review of the project through the course of its construction is to primarily review and monitor physical progress, financial progress, commercial performance, project quality, compliance to statutes and other Requirements. Such review to be conducted periodically (i.e. half yearly) over the construction period should cover | We understood that the responsibility of the consultant is limited to review of progress as per delivery schedule & guidelines. Thus consultant shall not be responsible for the QA & OC of construction work since the Periodic supervision is suggested quarterly and half yearly. | Duties of IRMA are clearly defined in RfP. |

| 29 | Appendix A, Construction Stage, il, b, Page no. 64 | Confirm that the materials used for construction are as per the specifications of contract agreement (The Consultant shall not themselves undertake any physical testing of material / product / construction quality. However, the Consultant may prevail on the Project Executing Agency (PEA) to conduct necessary tests. Costs for such testing should be borne by the PEA) | We understood that the consultant shall only review the adequacy and conformity of the material used in construction as per specifications in TOR. This will be reviewed and confirmed through the documentary evidences (RFI, Lab Test Reports. Batching Reports, Pour Cards etc.) produced by the contractor and thus consultant shall not actually do the quality check of the construction work. | Duties of IRMA are clearly defined in RfP. |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 30 | Clause 10, Page 7 of 90 | | We understand that financial proposal shall be exclusive of GST@18%. Please confirm. | Already defined in RfP. |
| 31 | ITB, Clause 22 (c), Page 13 of 90 | | Please relax the penalty clause and lower the penalty % presently @200% of the total payment pertaining to all visits to that project in case of consultant defaults or delays on the deliverable of a project thrice. | No change in original clause. |
| 32 | Data Sheet, Clause 8, Page 15 of 90 | | Please clarify regarding the submission of proposals: On line Submission: Technical proposal including scanned copy of EMD, bid processing fee and Power of Attorney in pdf format and Financial Proposal Technical; Physical Submission: EMD, Bid processing fee and Power of Attorney | Clearly mentioned in RfP. |
| 33 | Data Sheet, Clause 10, Criteria 1 (a), Page 16 of 90 | | We understand that "past experience in planning" refers to "past experience in design review services" and the same shall suffice the requirement of fulfilling the eligibility criteria. Please confirm. | Clearly clarified in RfP. |

| 34 | Data Sheet, Clause 10, Criteria 3, Page 17 of 90 | We understand that the bidder is required to submit the following CVs: • Team Leader – 1 nos. • Technical Experts – 5 nos. Please advise the number of man months for the afore mentioned experts. Are they required on "intermittent" or "fulltime" basis? In addition, please suggest the requirement of support staff? | As defined in RfP. |
|----|---|---|--|
| 35 | TOR, Clause 2.5.1, Pg 34 of 90 Appendix A, Pg. 63 of 90 | We understand that the Consultant is required to carry out half yearly visits to 24 nos. of mission cities with minimum 2 nos. of experts? Please confirm whether the Team Leader is required to participate in every site visit? However, the reports to be submitted on quarterly basis. Please suggest. | RfP clause on the matter is amply clear. |
| 36 | TOR, Clause 2.5.2, Pg 34 of 90 | We understand that the period of assignment is 3 years. In addition, the Consultant is required to carry-out one (1) site visit within one year after project completion. Please confirm. | RfP clause on the matter is amply clear. |
| 37 | Pre- construction, Clause (ii), Pg 64 of 90 | We understand that the Consultant will only assist the Client for land acquisition, statutory clearances, etc. The Consultant should not be solely responsible for such services. Please ad-vise. | RfP clause on the matter is amply clear. |
| 38 | Construction Stage, Clause (iii), Pg 64 of 90 | We understand that the Consultant is only required to witness and check tests being carried out by the Contractor, however, in case any additional tests as necessary to assess the quality of works are asked to be undertaken by the Consultant, then the | RfP clause on the matter is amply clear. |

| | | | same shall be paid by the Client as pactuals. | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|---|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| 39 | Pate 3 of 90 | Eligibility of Association of | | e confirm the number | | There is no such |
| | Clause 3 - | consultant and sub-consultant | | enture Partner can associate for bidding | | number. |
| | | | purpo | | | |
| 40 | Pate 7 of 90 | Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) No | | quest you to please | | No change in original |
| | Clause 12 - | bank guarantee will be accepted in | _ | ntee in lieu of Earne | est Money | clause. |
| 4.1 | Da 11 af | lieu of the earnest money deposit. | Depos | | | NI1 1 |
| 41 | Page 11 of 90 | Scope and Description of Short Listing Process | | nay request you to od of evaluation f | | No change in original clause. |
| | Clause - 20 | a) Financial bid of only technically | | act to encourage | or the award or | ciause. |
| | Clause - 20 | qualified bidders will be opened and | techn | 9 | rganizations to | |
| | | contract will be awarded to L1 (least | | ipate and benefit t | | |
| | | cost proposal) on the basis of Least | | evised clause may be | | |
| | | Cost Selection (LCS) method. | | nancial bid of only te | | |
| | | | | rs will be opened an | | |
| | | | award | led to the bidder who | o has scored more | |
| | | | | s as per 80:20 Qualit | č | |
| | | | | tion (QCBS) method. | | |
| 42 | Pate 15 of 90 | | | both the sub crite | | No change in original |
| | Clause no.10 | | | infrastructure pro | | clause. |
| | Criteria-1 | | | et repetition is also n | | |
| | Specific | | | he existing criteria r | | |
| | experience | | | a competitive res st and suggest to r | | |
| | | | - | | | |
| | | | experience of the bidder as following: As per RFP Suggestion | | | |
| | | | | Past experience | Past experience | |
| | | | | in planning, | in | |
| | | | | implementation | planning, | |
| | | | | and | implementation | |
| | | | | monitoring & | and monitoring | |
| | | | | evaluation of | & | |
| | | | | | evaluation of | |

| | | urba | n | infrastructure | |
|----|--|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | structure | projects costing | |
| | | | ects costing | Rs. | |
| | | | 0 crore | 10 crore or | |
| | | | ove each, in | above | |
| | | the a | • | each in India | |
| | | | ater supply, | and/or abroad* | |
| | | | rage/public | in | |
| | | healt | | past 10 years | |
| | | | neering, in | preceding the | |
| | | _ | and/or | proposal | |
| | | | ad* in past | submission | |
| | | 10 ye | - | date. | |
| | | - | eding the | date. | |
| | | prop | _ | | |
| | | 1 | nission date. | | |
| 43 | | | | tigious projects | No change in original |
| | | | | MICDC/IRMA) is | clause. |
| | | undergoing in India and identification of Key Exqualification mentioned in seems difficult, We request qualification of Team Lead | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | in RFP document st you to revise the | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | As per RF | P | Suggestion | |
| | | Position | Qualification | n Qualification | |
| | | Team | 2 marks for | 2 marks for | |
| | | Leader | Post- | Graduation | |
| | | cum | Graduation | in | |
| | | Monitoring | <i>-</i> | Civil Engg./ | |
| | | and | Civil Engg./ | | |
| | | Evaluation | | Health | |
| | | Specialist | Health | Engineering/ | |
| | | | Engineering | / Mechanical | |

| | | | Water Resources Engineering/ Mechanical Engineering AND 3 marks for Ph. D. or above | Engineering AND 3 marks for Post- Graduation in Civil Engg./ Public Health Engineering/ Water Resources Engineering /Mechanical Engineering or above | |
|----|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| 44 | Additional Clarification | | Please confirm that signing of consultar making payments to shall be "MoHUA". We understand the agreement shall be individual State/U confirm. | the consultants at no separate signed with | Agreement will be signed between concerned State/UT and the IRMA selected for that State/UT |
| 45 | Page 35 of 90 | Team Composition & Qualification Requirements. The bidders will ensure that the key professional proposed by them for a particular cluster, has not been proposed by | At present,4 IRMA opportunamely Bihar, Haryana, Punjab are active. We undereferred clause that a bepropose separate team for a We therefore request you this clause and allow bit | Rajasthan and erstand from the idder needs to ll these clusters. to kindly dilute | No change in original clause. |

| | | the same bidder for another cluster or by a different bidder for the same/ different cluster. In such case, the technical bids submitted by all such firms are liable to be rejected | same key experts for different clusters also. The proposed expert may be changed if the bidder wins more than one cluster IRMA with equal or better qualification and experience. Please confirm our understanding. | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 46 | General Extension of Timeline | | Request you to provide at least 4 weeks for bid Submission post release of bid queries. | No change in original clause. |
| 47 | Clause no. 12.1/ Page 9 | An EMD of Rs. 3,00,000 (Rupees Three Lakh only) in the 'form of Demand Draft (DD) drawn on any Scheduled Commercial Bank in favor of Pay and Accounts, (Main Secretariat) Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs and pay able at New Delhi must be submitted along with the Proposal | There are nine clusters for which RFP has been floated. And as there is no cap on the number of clusters that any shortlisted Consultant can apply for, any individual consultant shall apply for maximum clusters Hence, altogether, Rs. 27 lacs shall has to be paid in the form of DD This is a huge amount and shall result in considerable fund blockage Hence, we would request you to kindly allow submission of EMD in the form of Bank guarantee. | Bidding is for four cluster and not nine. Separate RfP is floated for each of the four clusters. Separate EMD in form of Demand Draft is to be submitted for each cluster. |
| 48 | Clause no. 16.3 / Page No. 11 | Financial negotiations: After the technical negotiations are over, financial negotiations should be carried out in order to reflect any change in financials due to change in scope of work or due to clarification on any aspect of the technical proposal during the technical negotiations. Under no circumstance, the financial negotiation shall result in to increase in the price originally quoted by the Bidder' Unless there are | May kindly clarify the following: • The financial negotiation shall reflect any change in the "Scope of Work". If there is a change in scope of work, there shall be invariably change in "manpower deployment" which will in turn affect the financial price. Hence, the provision for no change in financial price may not be tenable • Remuneration rates are subject to "scope" and extent of deployment"; | The clauses referred are self-explanatory. |

| 49 | Clause no. 16.5 / Page no. 11 | exceptional reasons, the financial negotiations will Involve neither the remuneration rates for staff nor other proposed unit rates. Conclusion of the negotiations; Negotiations Will conclude with a review of the draft Contract. To complete negotiations the Employer and the Consultant will initial the agreed Contract. If negotiations fail, the Tender inviting Authority will reject all the proposals | which again is a function of technical negotiation It is requested that the L2 bidder may be given the chance to take up the assignment if negotiation with L1 bidder fails | No change in original clause. |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 50 | Clause no.21 / Page no. 12 | received and invite fresh proposals. Part I, Part II, Part IV, Payments to be made on pro-rata basis | May kindly elaborate the term "pro-rata". Is it on the basis of number of states in the Cluster or number of total projects identified in the SAAP or both. Clarify on this is sought | Payment terms and conditions clearly defined in RfP. |
| 51 | Clause no.21 /Page 13 | Part: 5 % of the total cost of services for the State calculated on pro-rata basis from the agreed fee for the cluster will be paid after the first round of visits (fact finding visits) by the Consultant to all the cities in the concerned state. | We would request to increase" the 5% to 10% for this part | No change in original clause. |
| 52 | Clause no.21 / Page 13 | Part II: For each project an amount of 80% of the total cost of services for the State calculated on prorata basis from the agreed fee for the cluster will be paid equally spread over six site visits on submission and acceptance of relevant deliverables as per Appendix A & B | The formula as suggested for part III and spread over six site visits which amounts to three years engagement. We would request to modify this formula as: Fee payable per quarter = 80% of Total Applicable fee / 12; wherein 12 factor is determined out of 4 quarters in each of three years engagement. This will facilitate | No change in original clause. |

| | | | : O | |
|----|---------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | in Consultant's risk management of non- | | |
| | | payment realization owing to payout linked | | |
| | | | with project cost and SAAP size. | |
| 53 | Clause no.21 | Part IV: For each project, the final 10% | We would request to make this percentage | No change in original |
| | / Page 13 | of the payment shall be paid on | reduced to 5% as there is Considerable time | clause. |
| | | submission and acceptance of the | frame lost in realizing the final payment. | |
| | | overall assessment report assessing | | |
| | | the performance of the asset created | May kindly clarify about change in Cluster | |
| | | and service levels | Size; is it change in geographic coverage or | |
| | | Note: In case of any increase or | amount of SAAP of the Cluster. We would | |
| | | decrease in the amount of cluster size | like to clarify that | |
| | | with respect to the size given in | whatever is the changes, the total | |
| | | Appendix-E, the necessary adjustment | applicable pay out to the Consultant for | |
| | | in the payment already made to the | the project should not get reduced in any | |
| | | consultant, will be made in the | manner | |
| | | subsequent payments | | |
| 54 | Clause No. | Position: Team Leader cum Monitoring | We would request to allow full 3 marks for | No change in original |
| | 15.4; | and Evaluation | post-Graduation in Civil Engineering. | clause. |
| | Criteria 3- | Specialist; Marks wrt Qualification: 2 | | |
| | Marks wrt | marks for post- | | |
| | Qualification | Graduation in Civil Engg./ Public | | |
| | / Page 19 | Health Engineering AND 3 | | |
| | , 3 | marks for Ph.D. or above | | |
| 55 | Clause No. | Position: Technical Experts (5 | We would request to allow full 2 marks for | No change in original |
| | 15.4; | positions); Marks wrt | Graduation in Civil Engineering./ | clause. |
| | Criteria 3- | Qualification: 1.5 marks for | Mechanical Engg./public Health | |
| | Marks wrt | Graduation in Civil Engg./ | Engineering | |
| | Qualification | Mechanical Engg./Public Health | 8 8 | |
| | / Page 19 | Engineering AND 2 marks for | | |
| | ,6 | Graduation in Civil Engg./ Public | | |
| | | Health Engineering | | |
| 56 | Clause No. | One set of CVs is to be submitted. The | We would request to kindly modify this | No change in original |
| | 15.4; | bidders will ensure that the key | clause and allow submission of one set of | clause. |
| | Criteria 3- | professional proposed by them for a | CVs for multiple cluster and if selected, the | |
| | Marks wrt | particular cluster, has not been | bidder shall | |
| | | particular craster, mas not been | 22002 | |

| | Qualification | proposed by the same bidder for | provide CVs / professional with equivalent | |
|----|---------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| | / Page 19 | another cluster or by a different bidder | qualification and experience for all selected | |
| | / rage rs | for the same/different cluster. In such | clusters | |
| | | case, the technical bids submitted by | cidotoro | |
| | | all such firms are liable to be rejected. | | |
| 57 | Clause No. | At the time of submission of bids, the | We would request you to kindly delete this | No change in original |
| | 15.4; | bidders will also | clause as there may be possibility of | 0 |
| | Criteria 3- | ensure that the proposed key | competent individual joining the project | |
| | Marks wrt | professionals are not engaged by any | once acquired by the Consultant. This will | |
| | Qualification | firm in works related to IRMA under | enable in consolidating the personnel based | |
| | / Page 19 | AMRUT in any of | on location and provide a cost advantage | |
| | , 0 | those 18 States/UTs for which IRMA | also. | |
| | | has already been selected / appointed. | | |
| | | In such event, the technical bid | | |
| | | submitted by the bidder will be | | |
| | | rejected. The REoI for procurement of | | |
| | | IRMA under AMRUT dated 18.10.2017 | | |
| | | may be referred to for list of such | | |
| | | States/UTs | | |
| 58 | Clause no 22 | Penalty: If the consultant defaults or | May kindly quantify the penalty towards "all | No change in original |
| | / Page 1.3 | delays on the deliverables of a project | visits to that project. Further request you to | clause. |
| | | thrice, he shall be liable to pay to the | consider penalty subject to maximum of | |
| | | employer 200% of the total payment | 100% of | |
| | | pertaining to all visits to that project | total payment pertaining to that specific | |
| | | | visit in case of consultant defaulter delay on | |
| | | | deliverables of a project thrice. | |