

**CLARIFICATION/ADDENDUM- 02**

**MPAKVN Bhopal NIT No. 07/2018-19**

**CLARIFICATION/ADDENDUM ON THE QUERIES RAISED BY THE BIDDERS REGARDING TENDER DOCUMENT FOR – OFFERS ARE INVITED FOR CONSULTANCY FOR ARCHITECTURAL, STRUCTURAL & ALLIED SERVICES AND INTERIOR DESIGNING INCLUDING SUPERVISION AND QUALITY CONTROL MANAGEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SMART OFFICE BUILDING FOR M.P. TRIFAC & M.P. AKVN, (BHOPAL) (M.P.)**

**Response to Pre-Bid Meeting date 13/06/2018 at 11:30 AM**

(This document shall be part of Tender Document)

S.No.	Clause No./Reference	Query/Comments	Response by AKVN Bhopal
1	Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria & Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 & 15	<b>पृच्छा एवं मत :-</b> आर्किटेक्चरल, स्ट्रक्चरल इंटीरियर डिजाइन सुपरवीजन एवं क्वालिटी कन्ट्रोल जैसे महत्वपूर्ण कंसलटेन्सी कार्य हेतु मुख्य मूल्यांकन आधार "तकनीकी आधार" होना चाहियें।  प्रजेन्टेशन एवं तकनीकी गणना के आधार पर निविदाकारों का मूल्यांकन आर्किटेक्ट म.प्र. लोक निर्माण विभाग भोपाल के तहत सर्वमान्य प्रचलन के तहत (तकनीकी आधार 70 प्रतिशत एवं वित्तीय आधार 30 प्रतिशत) किया जाना उचित प्रतीत होता है।	मूल निविदा अनुसार
2	Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria & Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 & 15	<b>पृच्छा एवं मत :-</b> निविदा एनआईटी कं. 07/2018-19 में निविदाकारों के मूल्यांकन का बड़ा आधार तकनीकी न होकर वित्तीय आधार है। वित्तीय आधार के मूल्यांकन से आर्किटेक्चरल, स्ट्रक्चरल एवं क्वालिटी कन्ट्रोल जैसा महत्वपूर्ण भाग उपेक्षित प्रतीत होता है, जिससे कही न कही तकनीकी कारणों में समझौता महसूस हो रहा है।	मूल निविदा अनुसार
3	Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria & Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 & 15	<b>पृच्छा एवं मत :-</b> तकनीकी विड सक्षम निविदाकारों से ही वित्तीय विड का आधार सुनिश्चित किया जाना उचित प्रतीत होता है।	मूल निविदा अनुसार

4	<p>Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria &amp; Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 &amp; 15</p>	<p><b>Query with submission:</b> Financial turnover requirement is too high and non-inclusive. The project cost is 35 crores. Public development authorities put consulting charges at 2% which would be 70 lacs. If we refer to Govt. of India procurement policy of consultants 2017 page 85. Point no. 9.15.2) i) a) where it says that Avg. Financial turnover is 30% of the estimated cost. In that case, it should be 21 lacs avg. 3 years turnover.(See Annex 1 Attached) Alternatively, we would request not to put it into a prequalification, but instead give increasing marks for increased turnover. For minimum prequalification, we would request for the turnover to be 40 lacs. Avg.</p>	<p>As per original Bid</p>
5	<p>Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria &amp; Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 &amp; 15</p>	<p><b>Query with submission:</b> This normally leads to least quote winning and inferior quality work. In case of this tender for consulting on a smart and green building, the technical design and presentation should also have marks which should be carried across to the end as per the QCBS system suggested by Govt. of India procurement policy of consultants Annexure 1 at the following pages: Point 3.73.3: Page 31 Point 3.9: Page 32, 33 Point 6.9.2: Page 59-61 Which described the QCBS system giving importance to both quality and cost. An exemplar tender for architectural services which follows this system, is from CPWD-NIT as attached at Annexure 2: Page no. 38-45</p>	<p>As per original Bid</p>

//03//

6	Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria & Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 & 15	<b>Query with submission:</b> Sir, the design concept is very important and only the drawings cannot explain this properly. This needs to be explained in a power point presentation at your office for which 80% of the technical marks need to be allocated as per Annexure 2: Page no. 38,45	As per original Bid
7	Appendix G Clause 2.3 Deliverable/Mile stone Page no. 38,39	<b>Query with submission:</b> The fees percentage which has to be paid to the architect for dpr work to be increase as compare to the sqc work.	As per original Bid
8	Evaluation criteria Sr.no.02 Page no. 13	<b>Query with submission:</b> The concept plan should be one or two option instead of three options.	-----
9	Evaluation criteria Sr.no. 02 Page no. 13	<b>Query with submission:</b> Remove the condition of submitting three alternatives as the architect always present the best solution.	As per original Bid
10	-	<b>Query with submission:</b> Specific requirement with minimum area required or capacity shall be provided such as meeting hall with capacity of 250 persons, library, and area for MD's Room with ante room etc.	Meeting Hall - 80 MD Cabin - 08 Ante Room - 6 Nos. Other facility to be develops as per norms.
11	Evaluation criteria Sr.no. 02 Page no. 13	<b>Query with submission:</b> An honorarium shall be paid to the short listed architect for his presentation & drawings.	As per original Bid
12	Evaluation criteria Page no. 13&14	<b>Query with submission:</b> In place of lowest offer QCBS method shall be adopted.	As per original Bid
13	Evaluation criteria S.no. - 2 Page no. 13	<b>Query with submission:</b> Submission date shall be extended for preparing three alternatives. Additional time of two weeks shall be give.	<b>Amendment in Key dates :-</b> <b>Website : - <a href="http://www.mpakvnbhopal.nic.in/">http://www.mpakvnbhopal.nic.in/</a></b> <b>1.</b> Download of RFP Documents - Up to 02.07.2018 <b>2.</b> Submission of proposal - 02.07.2018 Up to 05:30 PM <b>3.</b> Opening of Technical proposal - 05.07.2018 at 03:00 PM <b>4.</b> Opening of Financial proposal - 16.07.2018 at 3:00 PM

Cont.page 04

//04//

<b>14</b>	Evaluation criteria S.no. - 2 Page no. 13	In the evaluation criteria point no. 2 you have asked for 3 alternatives with all the floor plants. 3dview etc. <b>Query with submission:</b> We have objections in this point as you are aware the architect, when they are in completion they have to present their best and every additional proposal directs it to draw is best. PIU PWD in each completion needs only one best solutions from the architect and pay Rs. 75000/- (Seventy five thousand only) for any of the short listed architect. Therefore it is unfair with the architected to asked for three alternations without -- paying any honorarium.	As per original Bid
<b>15</b>		<b>Query with submission:</b> With reference to the point no. 1 above be need to draw your attention and the requirement there is no detailed requirement is provided for the building. Only a list of various post in the department is provided. A detailed list of allied requirement is also require for planning such as meeting halls, library etc.	?
<b>16</b>	Evaluation criteria S.no. - 2 Page no. 13	<b>Query with submission:</b> There is provision of presentation of the concept drawing submitted. No weightage for presentation is given and submission of the concept shall have to mark each. This is unfair with the proposal. As any architectural project is a precious art work for the architect.	As per original Bid
<b>17</b>	Section-2 Instruction to Bidders. Evaluation criteria & Evaluation Methodology Page no. 13,14 & 15	<b>Query with submission:</b> After the long process the bid is based on the lowest financial offer then why concept of all the formalities at present such type of architecture work are being offered and quality and cost best selections (QCBS) be proposed to revised offer QCBS method so and appropriate weightage can be give on both the part. With this method you shall good quality work with reasonable cost.	As per original Bid

Executive Engineer  
MPAKVN Bhopal