

**OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
NATIONAL HIGHWAY CIRCLE, P.W.D, RAIPUR (C.G.)**

AMENDMENT NOTICE

NIT AMENDMENT NO. 1 /G/

Dated **02-04-09**

The following Ammendment are made in the NIT No. **17 /G/** dated 20/02/2009 for Preparation of Feasibility Report for 4/6 laning of NH 200 from Raipur (Km. 8.200) to Bilaspur (Km. 116.00) & NH-6 from Orissa Border (Km. 88.570) to Arang (Km. 239) Chhattisgarh State to be executed on Design, Build, Finance, Operate and Transfer ("**DBFOT**") Pattern

1.8 Schedule of Selection Process

The Authority would endeavour to adhere to the following schedule:

Event Description	Estimated Date	Amendment Date
1. Last date for receiving queries/clarifications	24-03-2009	--
2. Pre-Proposal Conference	28-03-2009	--
3. Authority response to queries	04-04-2009	04-04-2009
4. Proposal Due Date or PDD	13-04-2009	23-04-2009
5. Opening of Proposals	13-04-2009	23-04-2009
6. Letter of Award (LOA)	(Within 15 days of PDD)	
7. Signing of Agreement	Within 7 days of LOA	
8. Validity of Applications	90 days of Proposal Due Date	

Detailed of the above work can be viewed on line portal "<http://pwdchhattisgarh.com>"

Other Works Tender and condition will be remain unchanged.

Superintending Engineer
National Highway Circle, P.W.D.
Raipur (C.G.)

Decision taken during pre-proposal conference on 28-03-2009

Preparation of Feasibility Report for 4/6 laning of NH 200 from Raipur (Km. 8.200) to Bilaspur (Km. 116.00) & NH-6 from Orissa Border (Km. 88.570) to Arang (Km. 239) Chhattisgarh State to be executed on Design, Build, Finance, Operate and Transfer ("**DBFOT**") Pattern

S. No.	Name of Consultancy	Point of Queries/Classification			Clarification given by department	
		S. No.	Reference of RFP Document	Description (RFP)		Query
1	Sheladia Associates Inc.	1	Section 1: Instruction	It is mentioned that the Authority has decided to undertake Four laning from Km. 9/6 to 116/6 of NH-200.	Km. 116/6 is falling in the middle of the town and there is one ROB work going on at present. We feel the scope to be curtailed to Km 110 or 111 as it is not possible to do any thing within the city of Bilaspur.	Not Agreed.
		2	Section 2: Instruction to Applicants			
		a	Clause No, 2.2.3, Page No. 17	Applicant shall enclose with is proposal, Certificate(s) from Statutory Auditors stating its revenues from professional fees during the past three years and the payment received in respect of each of the eligible Assignments	Generally no consultant will take Separate Certificate from Auditor for each assignment, hence clause needs to be amended/deleted.	Not Agreed.
		b	Clause No. 2.20 Page No. 32	The applicant shall furnish as part of its proposal, a Bid Security of Rs. 1,50,000/-	Amount of Bid Security may be revised to Rs. 25,000/-	Not Agreed.
		c	Clause No. 2.1.4 Key personnel	It is mentioned that how many days each person to be at site.	But it is not specified what is the man months input of each Key Professional. It is required to have competitive quote form all the bidders. Otherwise each Consultant will quote on their won which may not give correct pricing.	Minimum presence (in days) is already mentioned. Hence There is no need to specify the man months.
		d	Clause 2.2.2D, Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel	For Team Leader it is mentioned that 10 years by leading two feasibility teams is the minimum criteria and for others it is 7 years.	How it is possible for a person having 10 years to lead two projects. Further so far the Team Leaders minimum eligibility is 20/15 years only. Similarly for other key positions. We request you to put minimum 15 years experience in Feasibility or DPRs in a senior position as the eligibility for Team Leader and for others 10 years shall be the experience requirements. Please modify the clause accordingly.	For Team-Leader minimum professional experience of 15 years is agreed (with five year experience as Team-Leader for preparation DPR for feasibility study). Period of experience of other Key personnel will remain unchanged.
		3	Appendices			
		a	Appendix-I Form 9	Form 9: Experience of Key Personnel	As Consultants are submitting signed CV's of Key Personnel (Form 6 & Form 12 of Appendix-I) along with the certification then From 9 & From 11 are the repetitive information hence, may be deleted.	Not Agreed.
		b	Appendix-I Form 11	Form 11: Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel.		
		c	Appendix-II Form 2, Note 4	Domestic air fare in item H1 shall not be payable to the Consultant personnel who are normally stationed in "[*****]"	"[*****]". Please specify the place.	Place will be "CHHATTISGARH"

(2)

S. No.	Name of Consultancy	Point of Queries/Classification			Clarification given by department	
		S. No.	Reference of RFP Document	Description (RFP)		Query
2	Meinhardt Singapore Pvt. Ltd.	4	Clause 4 (A) on Page No. 65	Inception report Consultant has to provide the Preliminary Finance Analysis during inception report.	In Inception report consultants provide the broad spectrum of the project i.e. project appreciation, work plan, methodology, task assignment and scheduled completion of various activities, Design standards, Quality Assurance Plan etc. No detailed studies are conducted at this stage. Since detailed survey and investigations are required for determining the financial feasibility of the project we required yourselves to kindly remove the Preliminary Financial Analysis from the inception Report.	Not Agreed.
		4	Clause 4 (I) on Page No. 68	Financial Analysis In case the viability gap funding clause no. 3.2 on Page No. 51 of RFP (O-D) survey, speed & delay survey.	ey speed & delay survey is not mentioned in traffic survey list, whereas O-D survey is important &	tion

			Origin & destination (O-D) survey speed &		Considering t projected in the
--	--	--	---	--	--------------------------------

					delay survey is not mentioned in traffic survey list,	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					whereas O-D survey is important & required for	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>traffic data analysis. Survey has to conduct as per provision made in IRC-S.P-19</p> <p>2 Clause no. 3.11 on Page 62 of RFP Scope of work for social study is not clear/may be stated in details. Input of social expert is also required. Kindly consider. Not Agreed.</p> <p>3</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				Project Duration	
--	--	--	--	------------------	--

						Considering t projected in the
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------

ing		g t	Feasibility Report	exceeds.....form the payment due	payment due to the Consultant.	e this Clause "In case the viability gap
-----	--	-----	--------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

				exceeds.....form the payment due		
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--	--

					to the Consultant. Since Inception Report comprises of preliminary studies exact costing cannot be worked out at this	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					stage. <input type="checkbox"/> We request yourselves to delete this Clause	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

in			exceeds the	projection in the deduction of 10% of the	...a deduction of 10% of the Agreement	yment due to the Consultant."
the		e	Consultant."	onsultant."	greed. 1 Che amount of work involved, it is requested to extend the key date for each stage by 2 to 4 weeks.	Not Agreed.

			Not Agreed.		
--	--	--	-------------	--	--

					1 The amount of work involved, it is requested to extend the key date for each stage by 2 to 4 weeks.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S. No.	Name of Consultancy	Point of Queries/Classification			Clarification given by department
		S. No.	Reference of RFP Document	Description (RFP)	
3	Consulting Engineering Services (I) Pvt. Ltd.	1		Upper age limit of Team leader should be 70 years. It is not mentioned in RFP document.	There is no age limit for Team Leader.
		2		Can Consultant proposed same team for composition for other package? This is not clear in RFP.	No, Separate team needed for each packages.
		3		As per clause 2.2.2 (B) page 16 of RFP the minimum turnover is 5 crore per annum, it should be increase 50 crores in place of 5 crore.	Not Agreed.
		4		As per Payment shcedule table page 127 (Annex-6) of RFP there is no payment on Inception Report stage. We request to PWD, NH that atleast 10% payment provision should be there.	Not Agreed.
		5		Sub soil investigation charges should be excluding and we requested to PWD, NH that same should be reimbursed of paid extra.	Sub soil investigation charges will not be paid extra.
		6		Performa 4 is missing "topographic Survey" in RFP page 78. Please provide the same.	Topographic survey will be conducted as per the IRC S.P-19
		7		As per RFP page 168 Appendix-II financial proposal" the total in item G shall, therefore be the amount for evaluation. But we request to PWD NH, that the financial evaluation should be excluding service tax and it should be done (G-F)	Not Agreed. As over all effect due to inclusion of service tax will be same for all.
		8		There will be at 3 weeks times will require after per-bid meeting to submit a good proposal and incorporate pre-bid queries. Therefore, this is request to PWD, NH please extend the proposal submission date for next 3 weeks.`	Proposal submission date is rescheduled as 23 April, 2009 instead of 13th April, 2009

S. No.	Name of Consultancy	Point of Queries/Classification			Clarification given by department
		S. No.	Reference of RFP Document	Description (RFP) Query	
4	Mukesh & Associates	1	Page No. 64	In the terms of reference Page No. 64 under Inception report it is given that, Inception Report must clearly spell out the broad strategy for structuring the project in a manner that would restrict the likely viability gap funding to a level not exceeding 20% of the capital cost of the project assuming an IRR of 12% in the event that a viable project does not seem feasible, the Consultant shall not proceed with the Consultancy and the same shall stand terminated. The Consultant shall be entitled to a payment of 10% of the Agreement value upon such termination. In order to assess the reliable viability of the project at this stage, consultant has to carryout traffic survey, topographic survey, improvement plan (including the bypass, structures etc) and preliminary cost estimate. The above require substantial input towards arriving the cost, revenue streams and complete 40 to 50 percentage of total feasibility study. Whereas, it is mentioned that only 10% of the agreement value will be paid in case the project is not feasible. We request you to kindly revise the percentage of payment to 40% upon termination in the event the project seems not feasible.	Not Agreed.
		2	Reference Item No. 6.2	Time and payment schedule, Page No. 73 it is given that, 15% payment will be made on submission of alignment plan and first traffic survey report. This stage of report demand 30% of the work requirement for total feasibility study. Hence the payment for the first stage of payment shall be revised atleast 25% of agreement value.	Not Agreed.
		3		The second stage of payment will be made on submission of Land Plan Schedule and Utility relocation plan report (KD3). Preparation of land plan schedule and preparation of utility shifting plan with cost of shifting utilities involve various agencies. According to the past experience in the NHAI project, the shifting of utilities and land plan schedule consume considerable amount of time and some time even beyond the duration of project. The time required for preparing the LPS and utility shifting depend on response time form the concerned agencies. Hence, we request you to kindly move the second stage of payment towards LPS to sixth stage.	Not Agreed.
		4		Please clarify, the type of arrangement made for acquisition of land for the project. As in case of NHAI projects, competent authority from the revenue department would be appointed to process the land acquisition required for the project. Please clarify, whether any such arrangement is envisaged for appointment of competent authority for field verification and approval of land acquisition for the project.	Competent Authorities from revenue department can be appointed to process the land acquisition required for the project.
		5		From the TOR we understand that design of alignment of project road involve detailed design of the project road including the vertical & horizontal alignment and intersection design. Since, it is a feasibility study preliminary alignment of the project road (to decide the length of road) would be sufficient. Detailed design of geometry would be required only at the detailed design stage and the same shall be carried out by the developer which will be proof checked by the independent consultant. We suggest that the projects which are proposed to be developed under DBFOT pattern, feasibility study with preliminary alignment design of the project with preliminary GAD for structures would be sufficient for estimating the project cost.	Not Agreed.