

Sr No	Reference Clause No	Page No	Clarification Particulars		Questions	Clarification
			Clause	Organization		
1	Clause 6 (PQ1)	23	Turnover	KPMG	Kindly raise from INR 25 Cr to INR 100 Cr to ensure genuine bidders with international capabilities to participate.	Clause remains unchanged.
2	Clause 12	31	Payment Terms (Bank Guarantee for each payments)	KPMG	Raising a BG against each payment milestone is very difficult and administrative overhead. Hence, request if a single BG against 10% of the project value being taken upfront towards performance.	Clause 12 of section 1 amended and new clause 12.3 added, please refer ADDENDUM No1. Clause 12 of section 2 (Payment Terms) amended and deleted note. Please refer ADDENDUM No1
3	Clause 4.3	20	Penalty clause (Refund of Fees in case of delay)	KPMG	There is a 0.5% penalty for delay. In case there is a delay in final deadline, the entire fees would be refunded along with 15% penal interest. Since the fees are anyways being returned to IPA, request if the penal interest can be waived	Clause 4.3 Amended, please refer ADDENDUM No1
4	Clause 10		Team Experience	KPMG	Kindly include the role for at least one international expert who can provide inputs for the	Clause remains unchanged.

					benchmarking and access to ports in other countries	
5	Clause 10 point 2a	28	Team Leader	KPMG	The experience of the Team Leader with 10 years is lower compared to the normal requirement for such an assignment. Request, if this can be increased to 15 years to ensure relevant senior persons are involved in such an important exercise	Clause remains unchanged.
6	Clause 10	28	Experience with Govt. ports	KPMG	Since this assignment requires the consultant to work with Major Ports, it is suggested that experience criteria may be added to demonstrate experience of the consultant with Major Ports/ Ministry of Shipping in consulting assignments. This will ensure that the Consultant is already aware of the context and operating environment of Major Ports and can deliver more effectively on operating efficiency	Clause remains unchanged.

					improvements in such a short time. We suggest that the international experience (25 marks) maybe reduced to 15 marks and 10 marks provided for experience with Major Ports	
7			Limitation of Liability	KPMG	Request that the liability of the consultant be limited to the one time fees under this engagement	Clause remains unchanged.
8	Section 3 (other Undertaking)	35	Undertaking re Non-disclosure of Confidential Information	KPMG	Request that IPA provide the text for undertaking related to this clause	Already given at page 35. Undertaking to this that non-disclosure/sharing of confidential information with third parties on company letter Head.
9	Clause 10	28	International Case Study	KPMG	Request that the international experience – value of assignment be reduced to USD 150,000 to enable a greater number of consultants to participate	Clause remains unchanged.
8	Clause 6 (PQ2)	23	Eligibility criteria International experience and ports network: The bidder should have worked with at least 3	Ernst & Young LLP	We would like to submit that since advisory services for infrastructure projects including transactions and/or	Clause remains unchanged.

			large ports(least 50MT per annum or equivalent container traffic) internationally in the last 5 years on relevant assignments with work similar to the described scope.		preparation of techno economic feasibility study etc. is a long process and as such most of the project may either be in the ongoing stage or may have completed prior to five years (for large infrastructure projects). As such we request the Authority to kindly consider assignments which have been completed within last 10 years or alternatively consider ongoing projects within last 5 years also.	
9	Clause 6 (PQ3)	24	Capability for this engagement: The bidder should have completed at least one assignment related to improvement of operational efficiency/organization efficiency for a port in India/Globally with traffic of at least 50Mt per annum or equivalent container traffic in the last 5 years. The scope should include	Ernst & Young LLP	We request the authority to reconsider this eligibility criterion on because in last five years there are hardly any operational improvement or organizational efficiency study been carried out at major ports. And there are few non major ports which meet the criterion of 50 MTPA installed capacity. So we request the authority to	Clause remains unchanged.

			benchmarking and study of best practices as part of the assignment.		reconsider this criterion and instead we would recommend considering DPR/techno economic feasibility report/transition advisory related assignment as minimum eligibility criterion.	
10	Clause 10, Point 1a	27	Evaluation of Proposal Case studies undertaking assignment related to benchmarking/Process maturity assessment/ Process Improvement/ Operations efficiency/cost reduction for port/terminal/dry-dock in India. This would be assessed inter-alia on the recency, size, no of assignments and relevance and quality of the assignments. Ideally, the bidder should demonstrate experience of having undertaken a comprehensive/multi-functional benchmarking, process analysis and efficiency improvement	Ernst & Young LLP	We request the authority to reconsider this eligibility criterion because there are hardly any operational improvement or organizational efficiency study been carried out at major ports. And there are few non major ports which meet the criterion of 50 MTPA installed capacity. So we request the authority to reconsider this criterion and instead we would recommend considering DPR/techno economic feasibility report/ transaction advisory related assignment as minimum eligibility	Clause remains unchanged.

			for a multi-purpose port /terminal of significant size. Assignments should be of a minimum value of Rs. 5 Crores.		criterion. Request you to reduce the minimum engagement value criteria INR 0.50 Crore.	
11	Clause 10, Point 1b	27	International case studies of undertaking assignment related to benchmarking/Process maturity assessment/ Process Improvement/ Operations efficiency/ cost reduction Port/ Terminal/Dry-dock outside India. This would be assessed inter-alia on the recency, size, no of assignments and relevance and quality of the assignments. Ideally, the bidder should demonstrate experience of having undertaken a comprehensive/multi-functional benchmarking, process analysis and efficiency improvement for a large port. Assignments should be of a minimum value of USD 750,000(INR 4.5 Crs)	Ernst & Young LLP	Request you to reduce the minimum engagement value criteria INR 1.0 Crore.	Clause remains unchanged.

IPA	RFQ for Benchmarking Study	Ref no :IPA/MSD/EDP/Benchmarking/2014
-----	----------------------------	---------------------------------------

12	Format TP-1)	(Pg 36 of RFP)		THE BOSTON CONSULTING GROUP	In para 2, the document mentions that we need to <i>'Insert a list with name and address of each associated consultant'</i> . Please confirm if this means that we have to share the details of our consortium partners here.	This is declaration for JV/Consortium, etc partner. In this regard, please read Form TP-2 (page 37) also.
13	Format TP – 4	(Pg 40 of RFP)		THE BOSTON CONSULTING GROUP	In point <i>c) Organization and Staffing</i> – we wanted to confirm that you have asked for detail module structure for the project with details of what each module will cover and the experts who will lead this module.	List the main disciplines of the Assignment/job, the key expert responsible, and proposed technical and support staff.
14	Format TP – 4	(Pg 41 of RFP)		THE BOSTON CONSULTING GROUP	In point number 13, we need to share the specific examples / projects of the expert, to illustrate the key responsibilities mentioned in point 12. Also, only examples / points that are relevant for the project should be highlighted.	Work undertaken that best illustrates Capability to Handle the Tasks Assigned.
15	Clause 18	15	Timeline and schedule	Deloitte	Request to extend the proposal due date by atleast three (3) weeks.	Please refer ADDENDUM No1

IPA	RFQ for Benchmarking Study	Ref no :IPA/MSD/EDP/Benchmarking/2014
-----	----------------------------	---------------------------------------

LEFT Blank