

REPLY TO PRE BID QUERIES

Sub: Consultancy Services for preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for capacity augmentation of various selected stretches of NH-181 and NH-381 in the State of Tamil Nadu.

Tender ID: - 2026_MoRTH_902622_1

Sr. No.	Clause No. of RFP	Description as per RFP	Query/Suggestion	Replies
1	Page No.17 Clause No.1.5.1 of Appendix-1 to TIS: Eligibility Criteria	<p>Joint Venture/ Consortium (JV/C) 6 1.5.1 The mode of bidding as well as JV provisions shall be categorized as under based on Tentative Project Cost of the Project as estimated by Authority:-</p> <p>For Normal Highway Projects: c) Tentative Project Cost >1000 Cr (Excluding GST and Excluding Land Cost): Only 1 JV partner allowed who should be an international firm of repute i.e. having experience of DPR of Highway Projects for multilateral agencies such as ADB/World Bank/JICA with aggregate length equal to or greater than DPR length under bidding besides meeting at least 40% minimum eligibility criteria. Lead Partner to meet 60% eligibility criteria.</p>	<p>We request clarification regarding the tentative project cost of the subject assignment, as the applicability of the Joint Venture (JV) provisions is linked to the project cost.</p> <p>Also, the requirement of having a JV partner exclusively with multilateral funding experience is quite stringent and may significantly restrict wider participation from qualified and experienced firms. The project being developing in India, we request you to allow JV partner with National/international firm having experience of DPR of Highway projects irrespective of the funding agency (including government-funded and other projects).</p>	As per RFP.
2	Page No.17 Clause No.1.4 of Appendix-1 to TIS: Eligibility Criteria	<p>Consultants may propose to associate Sub-consultants for specialised parts of the Services provided their names and details are clearly stated in the RFP. Such Sub- consultants should not circumvent the eligibility condition laid down above. The value of such sub-contracts shall not exceed the limit specified of 10% of consultancy assignment cost . Sub-contracting can</p>	<p>We presume that any number of associates can be proposed for specialised parts of the Services. Kindly confirm.</p>	As per RFP.

		only be done for specialized survey & investigation works after prior approval of the Implementing Agency. Nevertheless, the consultant shall solely remain responsible for sub-contracted portions of the Services. Key and Non-key personnel, whether full-time employees or on contract, shall not be considered subconsultants. Procurement of incidental goods, equipment hires, or labour engagement shall not be treated as subcontracting.		
<u>3</u>	Page No.21 Note no.2	In case of experience of Associate, the share as per MoU subject to Maximum 25% shall be considered. In case MoU does not specify the share the same can be considered as per certification of Statutory Auditors of the Associate Member.	Being an associate partner, we request you to consider 25% only in case the share is not mentioned in the completion certificate/MOU.	No change. As per RFP.
<u>4</u>	Page No.22	Running Projects (RP)= Length of DPR/Feasibility Projects for National Highways/Expressways in Hand wherein Completion Certificate has not been issued by Executing Government Agency or the Tender of the Civil Work has not been awarded by the Executing Government Agency. This length shall also include the projects for which the firm has emerged as the H-1 bidder but the LOA have not been issued. However, DPR which have not been put to tender since 5 years of signing of DPR Agreement shall not be considered as part of Running Projects nor as part of Completed Length.	We are currently undertaking ROB projects in various packages in Karnataka, wherein the project length was not specified in the RFP/Agreement. In this regard, kindly clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What length should be considered for such projects where length is not defined in the RFP/Agreement? • Can the consultant consider the length based on a 	Please refer to RFP.
<u>5</u>	Page No.39 Clause No.8.4 of SECTION II: INSTRUCTIONS TO CONSULTANTS (ITC)	The Consultant shall provide Bid Security as Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) for the amount shown in the TIS (or if permitted in TIS, a Bid Securing Declaration as Form T-9B in lieu of EMD).	We request clarification regarding the applicability of exemption from submission of EMD.	Please refer to RFP. Bid Securing Declaration permitted in lieu of Bid Security

6	Page No.305	<p>The experience of firm/sub-consultant in use of technology shall be supported by experience certificate. The experience of a firm/sub-consultant for a private concessionaire/ contractor (client) shall be considered on self-certification along with the client certificate of Government agencies not below the rank of EE/PD/GM or equivalent officer.</p>	<p>Generally, specialized services such as Aerial LiDAR surveys, Geophysical investigations, and advanced Structural Health Monitoring systems are typically carried out by expert consultants/vendors for Consultants and private contractors, and not always directly for Government clients. In such cases, obtaining certification from Government authorities may not always be feasible. Hence, we request you to kindly allow consideration of experience executed for private clients (consultants/contractors/concessionaires) based on Work orders and Completion certificates issued by such clients.</p>	No change. As per RFP.
7	Page No.307-318	<p>All Key Experts Full/Part Time Graduation from any IIT/NIT/IISC or Top 50 ranked engineering institutes as per NIRF ranking released by Ministry of Education (available as on bid due date) or Engineering Colleges of repute of Foreign Countries give full marks.</p> <p>For institutes ranked between 51-100 as per NIRF ranking released by Ministry of Education (available as on bid due date) give 75% marks i.e. 11.25 marks. For other AICTE approved colleges give 50% marks i.e. 7.5 marks</p>	<p>The above criteria for evaluation of Key Experts based on graduation from IIT/NIT/IISc or NIRF-ranked institutes is highly stringent and may significantly limit the availability of qualified professionals. Hence we request you to kindly adopt standard qualification criteria for Key Experts, focusing on Relevant educational qualification and Professional experience. Further, we request that uniform marks may be assigned</p>	No change. As per RFP.
8	Page No.329 and Page No.47	<p>Marking Scheme for Current DPR Rating (30 points)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Applicable DPR Rating as notified by NHAI/MoRTH (as on bid due date) shall be used to score the consultants out of 30 as per given criteria. This would be denoted as Sr.</p>	<p>At present, we note that DPR ratings have been released by NHAI, while the MoRTH DPR ratings are yet to be notified / made available, and many firms do not have access to their current rating status. In absence of a transparent and uniformly available rating framework, assigning marks based on DPR rating may lead to ambiguity and unequal evaluation among bidders.</p> <p>We request the Authority to kindly not consider DPR rating for evaluation at this stage, or Alternatively, apply this criterion only once the latest DPR ratings are officially published and made accessible to all bidders.</p>	As per RFP. DPR Rating as notified by NHAI (as on bid due date) shall be used to score the consultants out of 30.

			This will ensure fairness and transparency, for all participating consultants.	
<u>9</u>	Page No.48 Clause no.11	In the case of FBS, only the value of PBG shall have to be quoted by the bidder. However, PBG shall be quoted by the bidders subject to a minimum value of 5%. However, in case quoted PBG is less than 5%, then such bids shall be rejected. In the case of QBS, the final score is calculated by weighting the technical score, DPR rating score and score based on PBG Quote and adding them to obtain a combined final score, as explained in the sub-clauses below.	We understand that bidders are required to quote the PBG percentage, and higher PBG values may influence scoring under the evaluation criteria. However, quoting very high PBG values (up to 40%) may not be practical and could impact the cash flow of consultants, especially for long duration DPR assignments. Excessively high PBG requirements may: Create financial strain on consultants, Discourage participation from otherwise qualified firms and lead to unbalanced bidding, where financial strength dominates technical capability.	No change. As per RFP