

**Clarifications to Pre-Bid Queries**

**Sub: Preparation of DPR for construction of New Bridge across River Ganga with approaches parallel to Mahatma Gandhi Setu on NH-19 at Patna in Bihar.**

<b>SL No.</b>	<b>Clause No. as per RFP</b>	<b>Description of Queries and Comments / Clarifications / Modifications sought</b>	<b>Reply</b>
<b>1</b>	RFP document Page No- 19 Clause 12.1 Eligibility Requirement;	Considering the scope of work and requirement of project, we request you to reduce the minimum eligibility requirement of Preparation of DPR/Design for at least one bridge involving minimum individual span of 120m length to 100 m length. We request to empathise for this particular experience to be of Cable Stay Bridge / Extradosed /Segmental Bridge.	No change.
<b>2</b>	RFP document Page No- 19 Clause 12.1 Eligibility Requirement;	We request you to kindly consider any structure (Bridge/ROB/Flyover/Elevated Structure) instead of Bridge project only as the minimum eligibility criteria.	<p>1. Firm should have prepared DPR for at least one <b>River</b> Bridge project of 1000m length.</p> <p>2. Firm should have prepared DPR / Design for at least one bridge involving minimum individual span of 120m length.</p> <p>Refer Corrigendum - I to RFP.</p>
<b>3</b>	RFP document Page No- 19 Clause 12.1 Eligibility Requirement;	With reference to the above mentioned point we request you to please consider the 1000 m bridge length as RHS and LHS in total (i.e if Bridge length on RHS is 700 m and on LHS also 700 m, then take total length of bridge as 1400 m)	Not accepted.
<b>4</b>	RFP document Page No.74 Enclosure-I	Time period for Team Leader and Bridge Engineer is mentioned as 8 man months but duration of project is mentioned as 9 man months. Kindly clarify the duration of project.	As per our assessment, total inputs of all Key personnel are indicated in the RFP and no change is envisaged. The period of assignment is increased to 12 months in view of clarification provided under Sl. No. 14 with reference to Hydraulic Model Study.
<b>5</b>	RFP document Page no. 6	The Bid security validity mentioned is minimum 150 days from the last date of submission of proposal. But in Bank Guarantee format Form- E4, it is mentioned for 120	Validity of Bid Security is 150 days. BG Format amended. 120 days in

	Clause 3.1.1 (v):	days. Kindly clarify the validity of Bid Security.	Format may be read as 150 days. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
6	Table 1 of TOR Page No- 19 Clause 12.1 Eligibility Requirement;	It has been mentioned that Annual average Turnover that an average annual financial turnover from consultancy work during last 5 years should not be less than Rs. 5 Cr. In this regard it is requested that this Rs. 5 Cr. Turnover for a consultant is very much high. In consultancy works the fee to be charged is very small. So, keeping in view this fact, you are requested to please relax this condition of Annual average turnover for last 5 years of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs. 5 Cr. To average annual turnover for last 3 years of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs. 4 Cr. So that more consultants may submit their proposal.	Annual average turnover for <b>last 3 years</b> of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs.5.00 Crores. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
7	Clause 7 of LOI page 15	<p>Regarding Performance Securities, requirement is that “Bank Guarantee equivalent to 10% of the contract value will be deposited. The Bank Guarantee will be released by IAHE upon expiry of 3 years beyond the date of completion of services provided rectification of errors, if any, found during implementation of the contract for civil work and satisfactorily report by IAHE in this regard is issued.</p> <p>It is to submit that bankers have certain reservations to issue the bank guarantee for such a long period. Performance Guarantee may also be reduced to 5% similar to other works being executed in MoRT&amp;H and NHAI. It is to request that this clause should be modified as under:  “Performance Guarantee will be submitted in two parts of 2.5% each and one part will be released after submission of Final DPR and remaining 2.5% to be extended for one more year for any Modification in the DPR”. It is also requested that MoRT&amp;H circular no. RW-NH-35071/2/2013-S&amp;R(B) dated 16.01.2014 should be applicable for this job also.</p>	No change.
8		Regarding Time of completion mentioned at various places, we feel that 9 months period is very tight for such type of job. We request that the time of completion of services be enhanced to at least 12 Months.	Agreed. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
9		Regarding Manning schedule Enclosure -1 (page 74), the requirement of key persons at site is much more than justified. It should be reduced to half, otherwise it will not be possible to complete the job in time as most of the work is to be done in Design office. Further, total man	Regarding man months and total inputs of Key personnel, please refer reply to query at Sl.No.4. No other change.

		months for Team Leader and Bridge Engineer should be equal to time of completion of services.	
10	TOR, Page no. 28	<p><b>The scope of services shall comprise the following:</b></p> <p>x) Preparation of proposal &amp; cost appraisal for 4-lane bridge with 4-lane approach with provision for future expansion to 6-lane approach road and 6-lane bridge with 6-lane approach.</p> <p>As per clause 3 (x) of TOR, in final design both 4 lane and 6 lane bridge with approaches are required to be submitted – Please clarify.</p>	Options are required to be considered at the feasibility stage. Final DPR will be prepared for the design option finalized based on outcome of the feasibility study.
11	TOR, Page no. 28	<p><b>The scope of services shall comprise the following:</b></p> <p>xvii) Detail study of the dynamic behavior of the bridge structure and preparation of necessary documents for obtaining approval of the same from designated authority.</p> <p>Clause 3 (xvii) of TOR envisage the requirements of economic and financial model for project funding however, there is no man-month proposed on this account which requires clarification.</p>	The query is not clear. The TOR is self-explanatory. While no specific key personnel for Economic & Financial study is proposed in the TOR, the consultant is expected to get the requirements carried out within overall cost / bid price quoted.
12	TOR, Page no. 66-67	<p><b>11 Interaction with IAHE</b></p> <p>Clause 11, item 4 (regarding software) All equipment, software and books etc. required for satisfactory services for this project shall be obtained by the Consultant at their own cost and shall be their property.</p> <p><b>13 Data &amp; Software:</b></p> <p>4. <b>Software:</b> The Consultant shall also hand-over to IAHE floppies/CD's containing any general software including the financial model which has been specifically developed for the project. Clause 11, item 4 (regarding software) is contradict with clause 13 item 2.</p> <p>Please clarify whether the software purchased by consultant shall be handed over to client?</p>	The TOR is clear and self-explanatory.
13	Data Sheet, page no. 18	<p><b>Duration of the Project:</b> 9 months</p> <p>As per scope of work mentioned in the RFP, it is very difficult to complete the tasks in 9 months, so you are requested to kindly increase the project duration to 12 months and revised Manning Schedule, Schedule for submission of Reports and Documents (Enclosure-III)</p>	Regarding man months, total inputs of Key personnel and duration of the assignment please refer reply to query at Sl.No.4. However, regarding Schedule for submission of

		and financial format to be provided.	Reports and Documents, please refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
<b>14</b>		<p><b>General</b></p> <p>The Proposed River bridge is envisaged Hydraulic Model Study and Dynamic Analysis as per best industry practice and the RFP is silent about these. Kindly clarify if these requirements are to be considered in our technical and financial proposals.</p>	<p>The Consultant needs to conduct hydraulic model study to ascertain the impact of the foundations of the proposed bridge on the foundations of the existing bridge. Consultant has to Bid accordingly. As per Cl. 3.1 (xvii) of TOR, Consultant shall be responsible for “Detailed study of the dynamic behaviour of the bridge structure and preparation of necessary documents for obtaining approval of the same from designated authority”. However, regarding requirement for carrying out wind tunnel test, the same would be decided during the preparation of the report which shall be reimbursable.</p>
<b>15</b>	LOI, 3.2.4 CVs of Key Persons: Page No.8	<p>i) The CVs of the key personnel in the format as per Form T-11 is to be furnished. It may please be ensured that the format is strictly followed and the information furnished therein is true and correct. The CV must indicate the work in hand and the duration til which the person wil be required to be engaged in that assignment. <b>Experience certificates shall also be submitted.</b> If any information is found incorrect, at any stage, action including termination and debarment from future IAHE/ Ministry projects upto 2 years may be taken by IAHE on the personnel and the Firm. As the Client is aware that the experience Certificates from the past employers have not been a practice in the Country and Therefore, a large number of professionals do not take their experience certificates from their employers. Therefore the Consultant requests</p>	No change.



		<p>DPR preparation for at least one project of Bridge DPR involving minimum individual span length 120m.</p> <p>The Consultant would request the Client to amend the Experience in similar capacity. As there are several NH / <b>Expressways</b> / <b>SH</b> projects involving major bridges and elevated structures of more than 1000 m with Individual span length 120 m. But for such projects the Team Leader is not a bridge specialist and Senior Bridge Engineer is fully responsible for leading the team designing of major bridges and elevated structures. Keeping in view the above, The Consultant would request the Client to consider position of Senior Bridge Engineer in such projects in similar capacity and amend the requirement as: Experience in similar capacity: He should have worked as Team Leader or <b>Senior Bridge Engineer</b> for at least 1 project of 4/6 laning <b>NH</b> / <b>SH</b> / <b>Expressways</b> project involving major bridge, elevated structure and Bridge projects of length of minimum 1000 m and DPR preparation for at least one project of <b>NH</b> / <b>SH</b> / <b>Expressways</b> project involving major bridge, elevated structure and Bridge DPR involving minimum individual span length 120m.</p>	
18	Enclosure-II (Page no.75)	<p><b>Position:</b> <b>Highway cum Pavement Engineer Desirable:</b> Post Graduate in Highway Engineering or Transportation Engineering.</p> <p>The Consultant would like to request to also consider other <b>Civil Engineering related Fields</b> with the existing requirement. This may please be considered and Confirmed.</p>	No change
19	Data Sheet 12.2.1 (v) Page 22	<p>2 (ii) <b>Experience in Highway Projects (Bridge Projects for Senior Bridge Engineer)</b></p> <p>The Consultant would like to submit that the Experience of Highway <b>Projects involving major Bridge and elevated structures</b> may also be considered for Senior Bridge Engineer-cum-Team Leader in the evaluation of qualification and competence of Key Staff. This may please be considered and confirmed</p>	No change.
20	Enclosure-II (Page no.77)	<p><b>Qualification and Experience requirement of Key Personnel:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Material-cum-Geotechnical Engineer</b> “Experience in similar capacity: At least 2</p>	No change.

		<p>projects of 4/6 laning of major Bridge projects of length of minimum 500m length”</p> <p>The Consultant requests the Client to amend the same as:<b>Experience in similar capacity:</b> At least 2 projects of 4/6 laning (NH/SH/ Expressways) involving major bridge of length of minimum 500m.This may please be considered and Confirmed.</p>	
21	Enclosure-II (Page no.80)	<p><b>Qualification and Experience requirement of Key Personnel:</b></p> <p><b>Position</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Quantity Surveyor/Documentation Expert</b></p> <p><b>Experience in similar capacity:</b> At least 1 projects of 4/6 laning of major Bridge projects (NH/SH/ Expressways) of length of minimum 500m.”</p> <p>The Consultant requests the Client to amend the same as: <b>Experience in similar capacity:</b> At least 1 projects of 4/6 laning (NH/SH/ Expressways) involving major bridge of length of minimum 500m. This may please be considered and Confirmed.</p>	No change.
22	Clause 3.1.1 (ii), LOI, Page 6	<p>Completion certificates Consultants are required to Provide the completion Certificates indicating clearly the firms Design/DPR experience for The Major bridges, Viaducts, tunnels, hill slope stabilization, rock bolting, ground improvement, etc. Scope of services rendered by the firm should be clearly indicated in the certificate obtained from the Client.</p> <p>Normally, the Client does not indicate such Micro details in the certificate. It is requested that details furnished under the activities performed in the Project Data Sheet shall be given cognizance with due weight-age.</p>	No change.
23		You are requested to kindly confirm if a copy of the preliminary feasibility report for the proposed bridge will be provided by the Client.	No preliminary feasibility study for the proposed bridge has been carried out by IAHE.
24		Kindly confirm whether the proposed 4-lane bridge is to be built on single foundation or two separate 2-lane bridges with independent foundations.	To be decided during the study based on the suggestion of the appointed consultant.
25		You are requested to kindly confirm if any Model study is to be carried out.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.
26		As the proposed consultancy is for green field project, specific requirement if any thereof may please be indicated.	The query is not specific.

27	In para 3.1 XVII of TOR	It is mentioned that Dynamic Behavior study for the proposed bridge shall have to be carried out. It is presumed that the same refers to wind tunnel test. This may please be confirmed.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.
28	In para 3.1 (viii) of TOR	It is mentioned that conceptual drawings and cost appraisal for 3 nos. different types of bridges with different aesthetics like Extradosed type, cable stayed type and suspension type should be prepared. It is suggested that same also may include cantilever construction type superstructure. This may please be accepted.	Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
29	In Form-V of TOR	It is mentioned that in the proposal provision may be made for the following quantities of geotechnical Investigations. Boring in soil 2500m Boring in rock 100m It is presumed that the quantity of boring mentioned in the TOR is subject to change as per actual quantity of boring carried out and cost will be adjusted accordingly. This may please be confirmed.	Please refer note below Form –III of Appendix IV (Financial Proposal) of RFP.
30	Clause No. 7 of Letter of Invitations,	<b>Performance Security</b> The Consultant shall submit Performance Security @ 10% of the Contract value valid for a Period of three years Beyond the date of completion of services. The amount of Performance Security @10% of the contract amount appears to be on Higher side. Normally, in other projects of MORT&H and NHAI, this amount is 5% of the contract amount valid upto 3 months from the expiration of the Contract. Hence, the Client may kindly consider to reduce this amount to 5% of the Contract amount valid upto 3 months from the expiration of the Contract.	No change.
31	Clause 2.3 of SCC	<b>Commencement of Services</b> It is stated that the Consultant shall commence the services within 15 days from the Effective date of the Contract. Time period of 15 days to commence the services from the date of effective date of the Contract is inadequate for mobilization of staff on the project, as the Consultant needs more time to mobilize their staff. The Client may kindly provide at least 3 weeks to the Consultant to commence their services from the effective date.	No change.
32	Clause 3.5 of SCC	<b>Professional Liability Insurance</b> The Consultant shall provide to IAHE Professional Liability Insurance (PLI) for a period of five years beyond completion of Consultancy services or as per Applicable Law, whichever is higher. In other projects of MORT&H and NHAI, the duration of PLI is equal to duration of Contract agreement. Hence, the Client is requested to accept Professional Liability Insurance for	No change.



		the duration equal to period of Consultancy agreement.	
33	Clause No 6.3 (a) of SCC	<b>Advance Payment</b> As per Clause 6.3 (a) of SCC, no advance payment shall be made to the Consultants. In this regard, Consultant needs funds to mobilize their staff and maintain cash flow. Hence, Client is requested to kindly provide interest free advance payment @ 10% of the Contract amount and the same can be set off by the Client in equal portions against the payment schedule.	No change.
34	Clause No 9.2.4 of SCC	<b>Qualifications of Arbitrators</b> In the Clause No. 9.2.4 of SCC, there is a reference of Clause 8.2.1 (a) through (c). Since the referred Clause 8.2.1 (a) through (c) does not exist, it is felt that the stated Clause no. Clause 8.2.1 (a) through (c) should be read as 9.2.1 (a) through (c). The Client is requested to modify this Clause.	Corrected. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
35	Additional Point	<b>Extension of date</b> It is requested that the date of submission of the proposal may please be extended and a period of at least 3 weeks may please be given for preparation of the proposal from the date of issue of clarifications so that our experts can prepare a comprehensive proposal addressing all issues of the RFP document / ToR.	No change.
36		Firm should have prepared DPR for at least one Bridge project of 1000m length. Firm should have prepared DPR / Design for at least one bridge involving minimum individual span of 120m length.  Note: The experience of a firm in preparation of DPR for a private concessionaire/contractor shall not be considered. Please allow experience of a firm in preparation of Detailed Engineering carried out for a private contractor. In this regard, if you wish Experienced certificate issued from <b>private Concessionaire / Contractor may be endorsed from respective Govt. department</b> for verification	In case, the firm has experience in preparation of DPR for a private concessionaire/contractor, the Experience Certificate must be countersigned/endorsed by a Government Agency with detailed scope of work. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
37		Annual average turnover for last 5 years of the firm should be equal to or more than <b>Rs.5.00 Crores</b>  Please allow firms with Annual average turnover for last 3 years of the firm equal to or more than <b>Rs.5.00 Crores</b> , as followed in various NHAI and MORTH projects.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 6.
38	Page 6 of RFP, Letter of Invitation	<b>“Certificate should indicate clearly the firms Design/DPR experience for the Major bridges,, Viaducts, tunnels, hill slope Stabilization, rock</b>	No change.

	(LOI), Clause 3.1.1 (ii),	<b>bolting, ground improvement, etc. Scope of services rendered by the firm should be clearly indicated in the certificate obtained from the client”</b>  Quite often such kind of detail is not indicated in the certificate received from the client. We request that the details provided by the consultant in Form –E2/T3 may be treated as a supplemented to the client’s certificate	
<b>39</b>	Page 7 of RFP, Letter of Invitation (LOI), Clause 3.2.3 (viii)	<b>“The proposal should clearly identify and mention the details of Material Testing LAB FACILITIES to be used by the Consultants for the project (Form-T-8). In this connection, the house LAB FACILITIES up to a distance of maximum 400 km. from the project site being feasible would be accepted. For all other cases suitable nearby material Testing Laboratory shall be proposed before Contract Agreement is executed.”</b>  The said clause shall be exempted for those consultants whose are having fully equipped Mobile Testing Laboratory.	If all the stipulated tests can be performed in the Mobile Testing Laboratory, the same can be allowed.
<b>40</b>	Page 14 of RFP, Letter of Invitation (LOI) Clause 6.2,”	<b>Before the start of negotiations, the most preferred Consultant/Bidder (H-1) shall be asked to give justification for the cost quoted by them to the full satisfaction of IAHE.”</b>  The clause appears suspicious and justification is a subjective matter. When the authorities has already applied a check in screening the financial cost by implementing Clause 5.3.4 if LOI, any further scrutiny seems to be unwarranted. Requested for omitting the said clause.	No change.
<b>41</b>	Page 14 of RFP, Letter of Invitation (LOI) Clause 6.4	<b>“The financial proposal is subject to rationalization. Special attention will be paid to optimize the required outputs from the Consultants <u>within the available budget</u> and to define clearly the inputs required from the client to ensure satisfactory implementation of the Assignment.”</b>  We request the authorities to please specify the cost ceiling / available Budget for the consultancy assignment.	TOR is self-explanatory.
<b>42</b>	Page 18 of RFP – Data Sheet, Clause 3, and ‘Duration of the project’	<b>9 months Also Refer Enclosure-I Manning Schedule “Total Project Assignment (Nine Months)”</b>  The consultant requests that at least the position of Team Leader shall be continuous for the entire duration of the Project.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 4.
<b>43</b>	Page 19 of	<b>Note: The experience of a firm in preparation of DPR</b>	Please refer reply to query

	RFP – Data Sheet No 12.1: First Stage Evaluation – Eligibility Requirement s: S.No.2	<p><b>for a private concessionaire/contractor shall not be considered.</b></p> <p>“In case of South Korea, Most of Cable-Stayed bridges belong to the Government. Normally, after the Private Contractors got a contract agreement for EPC and/or Design Build project, they (private contractors) is making a separate contract agreement with a Consultancy firm.”</p> <p>For a competitive bidding, we request the amendment of this clause by considering acceptance of experience of firm in preparation of Detailed Project Report/ Feasibility of private entrepreneur/ contractor provided the firm submits a proof of agreement between the Govt. Body and the agency.</p>	at Sl. No. 36.
44	Page 19 of R.F.P. – Data Sheet, Clause 12.1, First Stage evaluation – eligibility requirement, Table-1: Minimum Eligibility Requirement s,	<p><b><u>Firm should have prepared DPR at least one Bridge project of 1000m length.</u></b></p> <p>A number of River bridges have been constructed in India with large viaduct spans in approaches to Bridge. It is requested that the length of bridge shall be cumulative of Main River span and viaduct spans under approaches.</p>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 2.
45	Page 19 of R.F.P. – Data Sheet, Clause 12.1, First Stage evaluation – eligibility requirement, Table-1	<p><b>Minimum Eligibility Requirements, “Note: The experience of a firm in preparation of DPR for a private concessionaire/contractor shall not be considered”</b></p> <p>Looking to the eligibility requirement, it is encouraged participation by reputed International Consultants. The consultant request waiving of this condition to enlarge the scope as it is not uncommon to prepare DPR by other agencies too.</p>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 36.
46	Page 24 of R.F.P., Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 1.3,	<p><b>“There is existing MG Setu Bridge which is four lane Bridge of 5.575km length between km 212.72 to 218.295 with approaches on Patna side 3.5 km length and Hajipur side 5 km.</b></p> <p>It is requested the hydrological and geo-technical investigation reports about the existing MG Setu &amp; its approaches are made available.</p>	Not available with IAHE.
47	Page 25 of R.F.P.,	<p><b>‘There was an existing Toll Plaza between km 212.00 which was closed due the <u>deteriorating condition of</u></b></p>	Not available with IAHE.

	Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), clause 2.1.3,	<b><u>existing Ganga Bridge</u></b>  The Consultancy may be apprised about the causes of deterioration of the existing bridge and remedial measures undertaken.	
48	Page 28 of R.F.P- , Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 3.1 (xv),	<b>“Providing protection works/ Guide Bund including preparation of necessary documents for obtaining approval from the designated authority like CWC/ Water Resource Department etc.”</b>  We understand that the consultant shall not bear any expenditure for the proposed modeling, if required for the protection or other retaining works streamlining the flow	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.
49	Page 28 of R.F.P- , Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 3.1 (xvii),	<b>“Detail study of the dynamic behavior of the bridge structure and preparation of necessary documents for obtaining approval of the same from designated authority.”</b>  Dynamic performance of a long span bridge structures is quite significant and it is likely to be handled by an expertise institution. The consultant request that this study shall be treated separately or alternatively the amount incurred for the special task is reimbursed.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.
50	Page 32 of RFP Terms of References, 4.9.1 Number of Location of Survey Stations.	We request the Authority to kindly provide an upper limit of the number of surveys to be conducted as it will have bearing on the financial part.	TOR is clear and self-explanatory.
51	Page 36 of RFP; Terms of References, 4.11.1 Reconnaissance and Alignment	<b>The Consultants should make an in-depth study of the available land width (ROW) topographic maps, satellite imageries and air photographs of the project area, geological maps, catchment area maps, contour plans, flood flow data and seismological data.</b>  The Satellite imagery procurement will take at least 2-3 months. We request client to procure the satellite imagery in advance.	Not available with IAHE. To be procured by the consultant.
52	Page 45 of RFP; Terms	<b>“The consultant shall collect details of disasters such as debris from historical records etc. and also whether</b>	No change. TOR is self-explanatory

	of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 4.11.4.2.(6),	<p><b>any facilities for disaster management such as silt dam is necessary.</b></p> <p>We could not exactly anticipate the role of consultant for this particular work. Kindly elaborate so that we may work out financial implications.</p>	
53	Page 45 of R.F.P. Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 4.11.4.3.(2),	<p><b>“ For the bridges identified to be in a distressed condition based upon the visual condition survey, supplementary testing shall be carried out as per IRC-SP:35 and IRC-SP:4. Selection of tests may be made based on the specific requirement of the structure.</b></p> <p>It is quite evident that the existing Ganga Bridge is in deplorable condition. The carrying out condition survey for this bridge in pursuance of RFP Clause 4.11.4.3 is itself a Project.</p> <p>Kindly clarify explicitly the role of the consultant regarding the existing Ganga Bridge.</p>	<p>Clause 4.11.4.3.(2) of TOR may now be read as: “The consultant shall obtain all the relevant details related to the existing MG Setu which could be utilized in deciding the design and implementation of the new bridge with approaches parallel to existing Mahatma Gandhi Setu at Patna in Bihar.”</p> <p>Refer Corrigendum- I to RFP.</p>
54	Page 51 of R.F.P. Terms of Reference for Consultancy Services (TOR), Clause 4.12.6 (xvii),	<p>We understand that if model study is required for the above said bridge, the consultancy fee for physical model study/Mathematical model study shall be borne by client</p>	<p>Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.</p>
55	Page 74 of R.F.P. Terms of Reference (TOR), Clause 3.12	<p><b>“In case Consultant does not obtain all the necessary clearances up to the completion of the assignment, <u>deduction up to 5% amount will be made from the final payment.</u> The amount thus deducted will be released after all necessary clearances have been obtained.</b></p> <p>Deductions shall only be resorted from the final payment, provided the delay is exclusively attributed on the part of the consultant.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
56	Page 74 of R.F.P, Enclosure-I,	<p>We request intermittent input for the following positions incorporated in the Manning Schedule.</p> <p>(i) Rehabilitation &amp; Resettlement Expert –for Social</p>	<p>While no specific key personnel is proposed in the TOR, the consultant is</p>

	Manning Schedule.	Impact Assessment. (ii)Electricity Expert- for electrification of Toll Plaza, bridges, interchanges, service roads, utility shifting etc. (iii) Financial Expert- for financial modeling, financial viability. (iv) Legal Expert – Documentation (v) Hydrologist – For hydrological calculations.	expected to get the requirements carried out within overall cost / bid price quoted.
57	Page-5 clause-1.10.1	The applicant shall furnish as part of its Proposal, a Bid Security of Rs 2,00,000 (Rupees two lakhs only) in the form of a Bank Guarantee issued by one of the Nationalized/ Scheduled Banks in India in favour of the Director, Indian Academy of Highway Engineers’ payable at Noida (the “Bid Security”) valid for a minimum period of 150 days (i.e.30 days beyond the validity of the bid) from the last date of Submission of proposals.  It is requested that Bid security in the form of Demand Draft may also be accepted. Can we submit bid security in form of Demand Draft of Rs 2,00,000 (Rupees two lakhs only).? pls. confirm	Demand Draft is also acceptable.
58	Clause 2.1.2 on Page 25	Approaches on the Patna sides of the proposed bridge should be adjusted within the existing available land. It may be a elevated structure / RE wall. However new approach road should amalgamate with existing approaches of the bridge on Patna side. This approach may require construction of an ROB and an viaduct which is required to cross the Patna – Howrah main rail line and four lane cross road of the town (known as old Patna bypass). Before proposing any alternative, feasibility of construction should be analyzed. Approaches on Hajipur side may be elevated or RE wall / earthen embankment or the combination of the these but need to be adjusted  As approaches on both sides of the proposed bridge are in built-up area. Hence, height of RE wall must be restricted upto 5.0m as per Cl. 7.1.(iv) of IRC:SP:84-2014. Remaining portion of approaches with height more than 5.0m will be elevated portion with viaduct spans. Please clarify the same whether height of the RE wall may be relaxed beyond 5.0m restriction.	To be decided during the study based on the suggestion of the appointed consultant.
59	Clause 4.11.4.2.(1) on Page No. 44 of RFP	The hydrological and hydraulic studies shall be carried out in accordance with IRC Special Publication No. 13 (“Guidelines for the Design of Small Bridges and Culverts”) and IRC:5 (“Standard Specifications & Code	To be decided during the study based on the suggestion of the appointed

		<p>of Practice for Road Bridges, Section I General Feature of Design”). These investigations shall be carried out for all existing drainage structures along the road sections under the study.</p> <p>As per Cl. 103.1 of IRC: 05-1998, design discharge for which the waterway of the bridge is to be designed, shall be based on maximum flood discharge of 50 years return period. This should be superseded as Cl. 7.5 of IRC:SP:84-2014 specifies the design discharge for a flood of 100 year return period. Also, IRC:112-2014 specifies the design life of the bridge as 100 years, Please clarify the same.</p>	consultant.
60	General : Facilities on main bridge	<p>Bus bay / rest area facilities on the main bridge portion has to be considered or the same will be considered in approach portion only Kindly specify the same.</p>	To be decided during the study based on the suggestion of the appointed consultant.
61	Clause 1.4 page 3	<p>1.4 The Consultants either in sole capacity or in JV may include an Associate. Joint Venture shall not have more than two firms. Can we go as: Lead Consultant + JV Consultant + Associate Consultant Or as, Lead Consultant + Associate Consultant 1 + Associate Consultant 2. Pls. clarify</p>	As stated in cl.1.4 , the sole consultant / JV may include <b>an</b> Associate.
62		<p>General Any proof checking required?</p>	Not envisaged.
63	4.11.4.2 Page 44	<p>Hydraulic and Hydrological Investigations Any kind of Hydraulic modelling required? If yes then then time duration (9 months) of study is less kindly enhance accordingly.</p>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 4 & 14.
64	STAGE 2: 10.3 Feasibility Report	<p>Need justification for the 2/4/6 lane bridge</p> <p>Study is to carryout feasibility studies and Preparation of DPR from for construction of <b>four lane Ganga Bridge with four lane approaches.</b></p> <p>Pls. clarify</p>	Options are required to be considered at the feasibility stage. Final DPR will be prepared for the design option finalized based on outcome of the feasibility study.
65		<p>Secondary information, design and detail for structures shall be necessary to decide the type of repair. Please confirm whether these details are available.</p>	The assignment does not envisage preparation of repair and rehabilitation proposal for existing MG setu.
66		We understand the total length indicated in Annex-II for	The total length indicated is

		each package is tentative and if there is any variation beyond (+ or - 5%) the same shall be paid for additional length based on pro-rata basis.	tentative. For change in Consultancy fee, please refer Clause no.10 (Change in Scope) of GCC of RFP.
67		The expenses towards Geotech investigations may be reimbursed as per actual in full within one month of submission of invoice.	Please refer reply to query at Sl.No. 29.
68	Page-157 Clause 7.2	<p>Retention Money</p> <p>As per clause 7.2 of general conditions of the draft contract agreement, an amount equivalent to 5% of the contract value shall be retained at the end of the contract for accuracy of design and quantities submitted and the same will be released after completion of civil contract work. or after 3 years from completion of consultancy services, whichever is earlier. The retention money will however be released by the Client on substitution by Bank Guarantee of the same amount valid up to the period as above.</p> <p>Pls. confirm the validity of BG.</p> <p>We request to kindly confirm a final date of releasing the amount as civil works may take a long time (may be 1/2/3/4 yrs.) to complete. Pls. clarify.</p>	RFP is clear and self-explanatory.
69	6.6, Page 14 read with Clause 4.5.2 of the General Conditions, Page 128	<p>Replacement of Key Personnel</p> <p>The client will not consider substitutions during contract negotiations/ contract implementation except under exceptional circumstances. For the reason other than death/ extreme medical ground, where replacement is proposed by the Consultant due to non availability of the originally proposed key personnel or in cases where replacement has become necessary as a key personnel proposed by the Consultant has been found to be unsuitable for the project by IAHE during contract negotiations / contract implementation , the following shall apply (i) for total replacement upto 33% of key personnel, remuneration shall be reduced by 5% (ii) for total replacement between 33% to 50%, remuneration shall be reduced by 10% (iii) for total replacement beyond 50% and 66% remuneration shall be reduced by 15% (iv) for total replacement beyond 66% of the total key personnel, the Client may initiate action for debarment of such consultant for future projects of MORT&amp;H/IAHE for a period of 6 months to 24 months. <b>If for any reason beyond the reasonable control of the consultants, it becomes necessary to</b></p>	No change.



		<p><b>replace any of the personnel, the consultants shall forthwith provide as a replacement a person of equivalent or better qualification and experience.</b></p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>a. The percentage deductions proposed for replacement of Key Personnel for total replacement between 33% to 50%, remuneration be reduced to 7.5% (iii) for total replacement beyond 50% and 66% remuneration be reduced by 10% ;</p> <p>The Consultant be given at least 30 -60 days to replace the Key personnel arising due to events beyond Consultants control.</p>	
<b>70</b>	7.1.1, Page 133	<p>Responsibility for Accuracy of Project Documents</p> <p><b>Recommend changes to the clause as reproduced below:</b></p> <p><i>“...He shall indemnify the Authority against any inaccuracy in the work which might surface during implementation of the project arising due to Consultants negligent acts, errors or omissions.....”</i></p>	No change.
<b>71</b>	6.8, Page 15	<p>If a Consultant fails to conclude the negotiations with IAHE or in case a consultant withdraws without starting / completing the negotiations with IAHE, it shall attract penalty –encashment of Bid Security submitted by the Consultant</p> <p>Request that the non-conclusion of negotiations with IAHE not be the only ground for the Client to encash the Bid Guarantee.</p> <p>Propose the following changes to the clause as reproduced below:</p> <p><i>“<del>If a Consultant fails to conclude the negotiations with IAHE or in case a consultant withdraws without starting / completing the negotiations with IAHE</del> <b>save and except for reasons beyond the reasonable control of the Consultant</b>, it shall attract penalty –encashment of Bid Security submitted by the Consultant.”</i></p>	No change.
<b>72</b>	7.3, 134	<p>Request clarification that penalty for error and variation is limited to 5% of the total contract value.</p>	RFP is clear and self-explanatory. It may go up to 10% of the total contract value.
<b>73</b>	7.3.3, Page 135	<p>Total amount of recovery from all penalties shall be limited to 10% of the Consultancy Fee.</p> <p>As per provisions under Clause 7.3, in specific Clause 7.3.2 (the Penalty imposed is 5% of the Contract</p>	No change.

		Value). <b>Request that the total Penalty is capped at 5% of the Contract Value instead of 10%</b>	
74	7.4.2, Page 135	Reference to NHAI The General Conditions of the Contract at several places make use of the word “NHAI” when this Contract is to be executed with the IAHE. <b>Recommend that the word NHAI wherever appearing needs to be replaced by IAHE.</b>	Corrected wherever required.
75	Pg 1	Period of assignment 9 months , should be extended to at least 15 months	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 4.
76	Pg10 Cl 3.2.4 xi	Can the foreign firm not be “parent firm” of the bidder, but the lead partner – and be involved to the extent of reviewing all the reports before submission and having staff visit the site	RFP is clear and self-explanatory.
77	Pg 26 Cl. 2.1.4	It says “The objective of this consultancy is to undertake feasibility studies and prepare a Feasibility Report of the Project Highway for the purpose of firming up the requirements in respect of development and construction of the Project Highway and Project Facilities”. Please clarify/correct.	This may be read as under: “The objective of this consultancy is to undertake <b>feasibility/detailed studies and prepare a Feasibility / Detailed Project Report</b> of the Project Highway for the purpose of firming up the requirements in respect of development and construction of the Project Highway and Project Facilities” Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
78	Pg26 Cl. 2.1.5	Can any other international code be used for the design if it is advantageous to the client instead of IRC SP84-2014; or IRC 112	TOR is clear and self-explanatory. Please refer 4.12.2.
79	pg29 CL. 3.1 x	Proposal is required for 4 lane bridge and 4 lane approaches with “provision for future expansion to 6-lane approach road and 6-lane bridge with 6-lane approach.” We presume this is an error and provision for expansion to 6 lanes is only for approaches.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 10.
80	pg40 Cl. 4.11.2.1 iv	Longitudinal and cross sections for major and minor streams shall cover Cross section of the channel at the site of proposed crossing and few cross sections at suitable distance both upstream and downstream, bed level upto top of banks and ground levels to a sufficient distance beyond the edges of channel, nature of existing surface soil in bed, banks & approaches, longitudinal section of channel showing site of bridge etc. These shall	To be decided as per site requirement during the preparation of DPR/Feasibility Report based on the suggestion of the appointed consultant.

		<p>be as per recommendations contained in IRC Special Publication No. 13 (Guidelines for the Design of Small Bridges and Culverts) and provisions of IRC:5 (“Standard Specifications &amp; Code of Practice for Road Bridges, Section 1 – General Features of Design”).</p> <p>At feasibility study stage cross sections at 200m interval may be taken.</p> <p>These shall be covered for how many km upstream and downstream of the project alignment?</p>	
<b>81</b>	pg43-46, pg53	Inventory and condition survey of existing pavement and structures; as well as dismantling/rehabilitation of existing structures – the study is for a new bridge and approaches – so why is this required; the study does not require remedial measures for repair/rehabilitation of the existing bridge and its approaches. If required, will it cover the existing bridge also?	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 53. Cl.no.4.11.4.3 and 4.12.6.2 of TOR has been modified suitably. Refer Corrigendum-I to RFP.
<b>82</b>	Pg43 Cl. 3	Can a laser roughometer be used, if existing alignment pavement is to be studied	TOR is self-explanatory.
<b>83</b>	pg53 Cl. 4.13.1	EIA is to be done as per ADB guidelines. This is to be a domestically funded project, then why not as per MOEF requirements.	TOR is clear and self-explanatory.
<b>84</b>	pg133 Cl. 6.3b	Payment for Geotechnical investigation should be made separately as per progress of the work; since for most consultants this is an outsourced activity and is a fairly substantial expenditure.	The RFP is clear and self-explanatory.
<b>85</b>	pg137	Change of Scope – there should be no reduction in fee if ultimately a 2 lane bridge is decided by the client instead of 4 lane bridge	The RFP is clear and self-explanatory.
<b>86</b>		Kindly give 21 days’ time for submission of project after receiving the pre-bid minutes	No change.
<b>87</b>	Para No. 1.4 (page-3)	for this case JV of more than 2 i.e. 3 firms may be allowed in view of the increase in number if projects being bid out by MORTH/NHAI/IAHE/NHIDCL etc.	No change.
<b>88</b>	Data Sheet clause No. 12 (Page – 12)	Annual average turnover for last 5 years may be increased to 15 crore, in order to being in fair competition among serious/ stable & well established firms.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 6.
<b>89</b>		Hydraulic Model studies are an essential part in establishing the correct and sustainable bridge length/configuration and the same needs more time. Hence this element may be kept in the scope & time may be increased for DPR preparation to minimum 12 to15	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 4 & 14.

		months. Bid process/prequalification etc. based on DPR may be taken up parallelly in the last few months of this time with the Model study results being the only element left for review of GAD.	
90	Clause No. 5.3.4 (page-12)	Regarding average value of financial bid to be taken as the basis for finalization of band ( $\pm 20\%$ ) is not fair to the consultants giving quality product.  The department may either provide a ceiling on the financial bid based on departmental estimate $\pm$ reasonable percentage over/below the departmental estimate or leave the bid amounts open but subject to 80:20 criteria alone for selection of the most preferred bidder.	No change.
91	Clause No. 3.2.3 (viii) (page-7)	The distance for lab facility may be increased to 700km or by considering the proposed project nearby large city/metro city (Kolkata) to obtain total investigations requirement of RFP.	No change.
92	Page No. 10, Clause No. 4.2.1)	Proof of payment of application processing fee amounting to Rs. 1295/- to M/s C-1 India Pvt Ltd is to be submitted. There is no mode of payment described in the bid documents so please clarify.	As per RFP.
93	“Table-1: Minimum Eligibility Requirements” at Page 19 of the TOR documents	Average annual financial turnover from consultancy work during last 5 years should not be less than Rs.5.00 Crores. In this regard it is requested that this Rs.5.00 Crores turnover for a consultant is very much high. Period of 5 years to calculate the average turnover is very long. Even MORT&H is taking period of 3 years to calculate the annual average turnover. So keeping in view this fact, you are requested to please relax this condition of Annual average turnover for last 5 years of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs. 5.00 Crores to Annual average turnover for last 3 years of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs. 5.00 Crores so that more consultants may submit their proposal. This will give a wide scope for selection of consultants to the department.	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 6.
94	Vide ToR Clause 4.12.6 page 50-51	“The data collected and investigation results shall be analysed to determine several parameters as given therein, however, The wind load test and Hydraulic model study will be an important aspect for Cable stayed bridge/Suspension bridges and its associated cost should be considered. Physical model may be carried out by CWPRS. Pune or mathematical modeling by IITs. <u>The client should consider paying directly for Hydraulic model study and Wind Load test both the bring</u>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 14.

		<u>uniformity in cost proposal.</u>	
95	Vide Data sheet clause 12.1 Table 1, page 19	<p>“The minimum eligibility Technical requirement in last 7 years is given which state that</p> <p>1) The firm should have prepared DPR for at least one Bridge Project of 1000 m length.</p> <p>2) Firm should have prepared DPR / Design for at least one bridge involving minimum individual span of 120m length.</p> <p>As most recent studies for long span bridges (across river Ganag/Gandak/Godeveri etc.) have been carried out on PPP mode or EPC mode as feasibility/detailed feasibility studies, IAHE should consider the Detailed Feasibility/DPR also as qualifying requirement.</p>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No. 2 & 36.
96		As this is an International competitive Bidding (ICB), A wholly owned Subsidiary Company registered/incorporated in India, for the purpose of meeting the eligibility criteria may utilise the financial and technical credentials of their parent / holding company. This will be subject to submission of an undertaking by the parent company that they will be providing the financial and technical back-up for the completion of this consultancy assignment and also will be wholly responsible for the services proposed to be rendered. Please confirm.	Accepted.
97	Bid Submission Date	Request for an extension of the bid submission date by at least 3 weeks from the date of issue of corrigendum.	No change.
98	<u>Table-1</u> <u>Minimum Eligibility Requirements on Page-19</u>	<p>With respect to TOR especially pursuant to clause 2.1.4 and 3 (viii) we observe that the minimum qualification given in RFP document is inconsistent with reference to scope of work given in these two clause where in Long span option in form of cable stayed or suspension bridge are to be explored for the bridge option study and subsequently designed.</p> <p>The qualification Criteria of 120m span is essentially a balanced cantilever bridge approaching toward the maximum economical limits or to the maximum lower limits of an extra dosed bridge. However since the firm may have to design Long span option in form of cable stayed or suspension bridge the Point 2 of qualification Criteria may be modified as under:</p> <p>Firm should have prepared DPR / Design for at least one</p>	Please refer reply to query at Sl. No.2 & 36. No other change is accepted.

		<p>bridge involving minimum individual span of 120m length involving Extradosed/ Cable Stayed/suspension design.</p> <p>Also as per our information maximum long span bridges all around the world have been build on design build format with contractor employing the consultant for the design and hence the authority may consider experience in the DPR done for Private sector.</p>	
<b>99</b>	Qualification of Team Leader	<p>Desirable Qualification of Team Leader as per TOR has been specified as M.Tech in structural Engineering and Maximum age has been specified as 70 years. However if the person who holds the Bachelor Degree and has a long experience of 40 years in design of long span bridges and has been recognized by international Bodies and association in form of Appreciation/Certificate/Gold medals for contribution to Bridge/structural Engineering may not score maximum marks as per evaluation criteria. Secondly if the same person is just over 70, his CV will not be eligible, although he is practicing engineer with lot of state of the art knowledge of Long Span Bridge Design. Hence the Following Changes shall be considered.</p> <p>Desirable Qualification: M. Tech in Structure Engineering/international Recognition in form of Appreciation/Certificates/Gold medals for contribution to Bridge/structural Engineering by international Bodies.</p> <p>Age Limit: 75 years</p> <p>Also since the team leader has to guide the design of long span bodies Experience in similar capacity may be modified as under</p> <p>He should have worked as team Leader for at least 1 projects of 4/6 laning of major Bridge projects of length of maximum 1000m and DPR Preparation for at least one project of Bridge Stayed/suspension design.</p>	No change.
<b>100</b>	Qualification of Bridge Engineer	<p>Since the Bridge engineer has to carry out the design of long span bridges Experience in similar capacity may be modified as under</p> <p>Bridge Engineer in Highway design consultancy projects (NH/SH/Expressways) involving design minimum two major bridges/Structures (length more than 500 m) and</p>	No Change.

		least one project of Bridge DPR involving minimum individual span length 120m Extradosed/Cable Stayed/suspension design.	
101	<u>Clause 1.8.1 of Letter of Invitation on page 4</u>	<p><b>Power of Attorney</b></p> <p>“The proposals must be properly signed as detailed below:</p> <p>iii. by a duly authorized person holding the Power of Attorney in case of a Limited Company or a corporation (<b>A certified copy of the Power of Attorney on a stamp paper of Rs. 100</b> and duly notarized shall accompany the proposal).”</p> <p>We request you to kindly allow foreign firms to submit duly notarized PoA on their Letter head as the stamp paper is not valid for them in their country. Kindly consider.</p>	No Change.
102	<u>Clause 1.8.2 of Letter of Invitation on page 4</u>	<p><b>Memorandum of Understanding</b></p> <p>“In case a Joint Venture/Association of firms, the proposal shall be accompanied by a certified copy of legally binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on a stamp paper of Rs.100, signed by all firms”</p> <p>We request you to kindly allow foreign firms to submit duly notarized MoU on plain paper as the stamp paper is not valid for them in their country. Kindly consider.</p>	No Change.
103	<u>Clause 3.1.1 of Letter of Invitation on Page 6</u>	<p><b>Firm Turnover for the last 5 years</b></p> <p>“<b>Firm’s turnover for the last 5 years:</b> A tabular statement as in Form E3 showing the turnover of the applicant firm(s) for the last five years beginning with the last financial year certified by the Chartered Account along with <b>certified copies of the audit reports</b> shall be submitted in support of the turnover.”</p> <p>The Consultant would like to bring it to your notice that our audit for FY 2014-15 is not completed. Thus, Audited/Certified copy of Balance sheet for FY 2014-15 is not available. We request you to kindly allow us to submit audited figures from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14. Kindly consider.</p>	Sl. No. 6 may be referred. In cases where, Audited/ Certified copy of Balance Sheet for the FY 2014-15 is available, last three years shall be counted from 2012-13 to 2014-15. However, where audited / certified copy of the Balance Sheet for the FY 2014-15 is not available (as certified by the Statutory auditor) then in such cases last three years shall be considered from 2011-12 to 2013-14.
104	<u>Table-1:</u>	<b>Minimum Eligibility Requirements</b>	Please refer reply to query

	<u>Minimum Eligibility Requirements in Data Sheet on Page 19</u>	<p>We would like to submit here that a bridge constructed over water or creek is different to a bridge constructed on land. Accordingly, we request you to change the minimum eligibility requirement to read as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firms should have prepared DPR for at least one bridge constructed over water or creek of length 1000m.</li> <li>2. Firm should have prepared DPR/Design for at least one bridge constructed over water or creek involving minimum individual span of 120 m length.</li> </ol>	<p>at Sl. No. 2 &amp; 36.</p>
<p><b>105</b></p>	<p><u>Clause 5.3.4 on Page 12 &amp; 13</u></p>	<p><b>Reasonable Financial Proposals</b></p> <p>“If 3 or more Financial Proposals are opened, Average of all the opened Financial Proposals shall be determined. A Financial Proposal shall be considered “<b>reasonable</b>” if it lies within (+) / ( - ) 20% of the average. Only bidders with a “<b>reasonable Financial Proposal</b>” shall be considered for determining the “<b>most preferred bidder (H-1)</b>” based on QCBS (80 % weightage on Technical Proposal and 20 % weightage on Financial Proposal). ”</p> <p>We would like to submit that this is a specialized bridge project, where quality of input can vary the cost drastically. Therefore, we request you to kindly delete these clauses.</p>	<p><b>No change.</b></p>
<p><b>106</b></p>		<p><b>Extension of Time</b></p> <p>It is requested that the date of submission of proposal may please be extended and at least 3 weeks’ time may kindly be provided from the date of issue of Clarification to prepare a comprehensive proposal .</p>	<p><b>No change.</b></p>