

Response to the Suggestions made at the Pre Bid Conference held on December 8, 2011 at Conference Room of India Trade Promotion Organisation, New Delhi with respect to RFP for selection of Adviser cum Project Management Consultant for development of International Convention and Exhibition Centre

RFP Paragraph	Query/ Suggestion	Response/ Amendment made in RFP subsequently
	What is the reason behind the re-tendering?	None of the bids received earlier met the eligibility criteria.
	As one of the largest PMC in India we bid for the last RFP but were rejected. Can we bid again?	A bidder must meet the eligibility criteria and provide documentary authentication.
	Based on requests in this meeting if any amendment is made in the RFP bid document will it be notified ?	Amendments, if any will be notified on our web site.
1.1.3	Is it a brown field or green field project and to what extent and what is the square feet area that has to be built up?	The construction will replace old buildings which will be demolished and our intention of 100,000 sq mtrs is already mentioned at para 1.1.6 (iv)
1.1.3	How will the project be funded?	ITPO will manage funding through appropriate mechanism.
1.1.3	When the change of Land Use of Pragati Maidan expected to be notified?	Process is continuing.
1.1.11 & Annexure I	The last date for submission of bids should be extended considering the Christmas and yearend holidays.	The last date has been amended as 31 st January, 2012.
1.2.3 (c) (iii)	What is the meaning of "carrying out the necessary modification, design, drawings as may be required"?	The design / drawings should conform to laws and regulations and should be cleared by local authorities for which changes may be required at different stages.
1.2.3 (c),(d),(e), (f), (g), ((h)	What would be the role of Adviser cum PMC in design and execution of the project?	The role is explained at para 1.2.3 (c),(d),(e), (f), (g), ((h)
1.3.6	RFP has not laid down minimum qualifications, experience of individual members of team to be deployed for the work.	A core team of professionals as per para 1.3.6 (i), would be drawn from company/ members of the consortium.
1.3.2.2	A consortium bidder shall be required to be incorporated under the Companies Act involving equity investment in the new	Para deleted

	company.	
1.3.2.3 (e)	Clarifications on the Shareholding pattern of SPV	Para 1.3.2.3 (e) amended consequent on deletion of para 1.3.2.2
1.3.2.3 (e)	Instead of a consortium having to incorporate - a consortium agreement can make the members jointly and severally responsible for discharge of their obligations	
1.4.2	The exchange rate of US\$ 1 should be revised from Rs.45 to a more current realistic figure Rs. 50	No change
1.5.3 & 1.5.4	Is tender fee refundable?	Tender fee is not refundable.
1.5.4 (a)	When shall the bank guarantee submitted with our unsuccessful bid against the last RFP be returned?	Bank guarantees have since been returned.
1.7.2.	i. Clarification on the drop dead fee of Rs. 20 lakhs in case ITPO abandon the project at any stage. ii. The Drop dead fee should be higher.	i. Provision is clear in para 1.7.2 ii. No change.
1.8.1(iv)(a)	"5% on completion of activities laid down in Para 1.2.3 (d) above" suggests a long interval considering time required for approvals etc.	
1.9.3	Would the Adviser cum PMC be responsible or penalized for delays in getting approvals authorities?	No
1.13 (b)	Sole Arbitrator should be appointed with mutual agreement. We request you to kindly take a legal opinion on this.	Para 1.13 (b) has been amended.