

Government of India  
Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship  
Economic & Policy Wing  
(\*\*\*\*)

**Minutes of the Pre-Bid Meeting**

**Brief Description of the RfP:** Request for Proposal for Consultancy for Evaluation of 6 Centrally Sponsored Schemes under Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship (MSDE).

**Bid Ref:** FNo. SD-17/89/2019- O/o SA

**Date & Time of Pre-Bid Meeting:** 05.11.2019 at 15:30 Hrs

**Venue of the Meeting:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Conference Room, PTI Building,  
Sansad Marg, New Delhi.

**The Following Officers of MSDE and Bidders attended the pre-bid meeting.**

1. Dr B. K Ray, Deputy Secretary, E&P Wing (Addtl. Charge), MSDE
2. Shri D P Singh, Deputy Secretary, SNP Division, MSDE
3. Shri P L Meena, Deputy Secretary, E&P Wing, MSDE
4. Shri Sanjay Sharma, Under Secretary, E&P Wing, MSDE
5. Shri Alok Nigam, Deputy Director, E&P Wing, MSDE
6. Ms. Mamta Meena, Deputy Director, E&P Wing, MSDE
7. Mr Tarun Baijnath, Director, Grant Thornton,
8. Ms Manisha Bhattacharjee, Sr. Analyst, IPE Global Ltd.
9. Dr B S Satyanarayana, Strategic Adviser, Quest Ltd.
10. Mr Ashutosh Makup, Deputy Director, National Productivity Council
11. Mr Rajat Tokas, Consultant, KPMG
12. Mr Senthil Raja, Adviser, Deloitte
13. Mr Sudhanshu Malhotra, Sambodhi Research
14. Ms Sakshi Chauhan, EY LLP
15. Mr Deborshi Chakraborty, EY LLP
16. Mr Manish Verma, Jamia Hamdard University
17. Mr Harish Nagpal, PWC
18. Mr Shuvadeep Ray, Consultant, E&P Wing, MSDE

**Proceedings of the Pre-Bid meeting:**

1. At the Outset, Dr B K Ray, Deputy Secretary, MSDE, welcomed all the participants, made a briefing about the scope of services and purpose of the pre-bid meeting.
2. Thereafter he requested the participants to raise the queries one by one starting from those who didn't sent their queries to rest of the participant who had already conveyed their queries through mail.

3. The queries from prospective bidders were appropriately responded. The participants were further requested to send their queries in writing through mail, by night same day.
4. The response to queries sought from prospective bidders in writing and those asked during the meeting have been compiled as per Annexure-I.
5. The amendments made in pursuance of the RfP at Clause 1.7 of the RfP document is hereby extended and the details are as given below:

SL No.	Event Description	Date	Time
1	Last date for submission of bid	18.11.2019	11:00 am
2	Opening of Technical Proposals	19.11.2019	02:30 pm
3	Presentation for Technical Proposal	20.11.2019 to 22.11.2019	(time would be notified separately)



(Sanjay Sharma)

Under Secretary to Government of India  
Tel: 011-23465921

\*\*\*\*\*



Annexure-I

Replies to Pre-Bid Queries

SL No.	Name of Organizations	Pg No./Clause No./Section/Clause	Queries	Reply
1.	EY, KPMG, Grant Thornton, Deloitte, IPE Global, Vision EIS Consulting, NPC, PWC	9/1.7 Schedule of Selection Process/ Last date for submission of bid	The proposal due date is only 2-3 days post Authority response to pre-bid queries, which is a short time. Since considerable time is required for preparing a mandate of this size and detailed information required for Technical and Financial proposals, request to kindly extend the proposal due date to at least 3 weeks post Authority response.	The request has been considered.  The last date for submission of proposal has been extended by 10 days.
2	EY, IPE Global, Grant Thornton	13/2.2 Conditions of Eligibility of Applicants/(A) Technical Capacity The Applicant should be a Private/ Public limited company or partnership firm or expert institution with operations in India.	Can lead firm enter into the consortium based on schemes and geographical need.  We hereby request the Department to kindly include Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) firms under the given criteria.	Clause 2.1 of the RfP is self explanatory. In case of consortium the Lead/Primary Bidder shall be legally accountable for the completion of whole project.  It is further clarified any registered firm/company/institution who has evaluated similar Government projects are eligible.
3	EY, NPC, Sambodhi, Vision EIS Consulting	13/2.1. Scope of Proposal 2.2. Conditions of Eligibility of Applicants/(B) Financial Capacity: The Applicant shall have received a minimum income of Rs. 50 (fifty) crores per annum from professional fees during each of the last 3 (three) financial years.	We request client to kindly clarify as who will be the "Lead Member" of the consortium, the firm which fulfill the minimum income of Rs. 50 (fifty) crores per annum or the firm which fulfill all the eligible general assignments and eligible specific assignments?	Yes, the Primary/Lead member should have a turnover of Rs 50 crores per annum.
4	EY, Vision EIS Consulting, Deloitte, IPE Global, KPMG, PWC	13/ 2.2.3 Conditions of Eligibility for key personnel/ Core Team (Expected to be deployed full time over the entire duration of the assignment)	(i) Are the key experts expected to be based out of MSDE office in New Delhi for the project duration? What exactly is the expectation from full time deployment of key experts? Can non-core personnel work remotely?  (ii) Some of the Core Team Members may not be required	(i) RfP has not provided any geographical limitation.  (ii) & (iii) The Work Assignment should be

			<p>to be involved full time. Are we allowed to propose the man-days of the core team members as per the requirement of the Approach and Methodology, or it is mandatory to provide all core team members for the full time?</p> <p>(iii) Full availability over the entire assignment of the Core Team would likely to be a challenge and if could reconsider.</p>	<p>expressed in man days for each member without compromising quality of work /evaluation of scheme.</p>
5	EY	13/ 2.2.3 Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel/ Core Team (to be scored as a part of the bid evaluation)	<p>We seek greater clarity on the eligibility of the deputy team leader as it is an uncommon designation and people who have played the role of a deputy team leader are not easily available.</p>	<p>It is intended that there should be a second in command at the time of evaluation to meet the requirement of contingency.</p>
6	EY, KPMG	13/ 2.2.3 Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel/ Non-core Team (To be deployed based on approach and methodology adopted for the assignment and requirements of the Scheme)	<p>As it is not mentioned under 2.2.3 about non -core team will form part of the evaluation or not. Whereas in 3.1.3 The scoring criteria to be used for evaluation 20 marks are given against evaluation of Non-core team deployment as per the scheme requirement, is it necessary to provide their names/CV at the bidding stage?</p>	<p>The marking scheme given in the RFP shall be followed.</p>
7	EY, KPMG	14/ 2.2.3 Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel/ Non-core Team (To be deployed based on approach and methodology adopted for the assignment and requirements of the Scheme)	<p>(i) As non-core team members who are not required to work full time, can be utilized on multiple projects? If Yes, will core teams that have distinct team members be given higher weightage in the technical round.</p> <p>(ii) Based on the minimum time mentioned for the Non-Core team and as they are not expected to be deployed full-time, can the non-core team members be proposed for more than one scheme evaluation.</p> <p>(iii) Can the time frame for Non-core team vary from the numbers indicated in the RFP, based on requirements and A&amp;M to be followed and to be included in the financial</p>	<p>(i), (ii) &amp; (iii) The engagement of each should be expressed in terms of man days without compromising quality of work /evaluation of scheme.</p>



			proposal accordingly. Kindly confirm	
8	EY, Deloitte, Grant Thornton,	15/ 2.2.3 Conditions of Eligibility for Key Personnel / Non-core Team: Civil Engineer	Responsibilities of Civil Engineer is not defined in 2.1.4 Key Personnel for any one of the Scheme for evaluation is being considered to be done and under Form 6- Particulars of Key Personnel is not asked for civil engineer, kindly clarify	Clause 2.2.3 of the RfP defines the role & responsibilities of Civil Engineer.
9	EY, KPMG, NPC, Grant Thornton	19/2.13 Technical Proposal: Appendix-I/ Applicants shall submit the technical proposal in the formats at Appendix-I	Will form 6 Particulars of Key Personnel, Form 8 (Abstract of Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel), form 10 (Eligible Assignments of Key Personnel) and form 11 (Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Key Personnel) have to be filled for the non-core team as well?  According to Clause 2.1.4, Key Personnel have been described as the Core Team and Non-Core Team. However, As per RFP page-11: Non-core Team (Expected to be deployed based on approach and methodology adopted for the assignment and requirements of the client, but not to be evaluated as a part of the bid).	Yes, for all. Detailed CV of both core and non-core personnel has to be provided.  Marking scheme in RfP is part of the evaluation criteria.
10	EY, Vision EIS Consulting, PWC	22/ 2.17 Substitution of Key Personnel (2.17.2)/ As a condition to such substitution, a sum equal to 20% (twenty percent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel shall be deducted from the payments due to the Consultant. In the case of a second substitution hereunder, such deduction shall be 50% (fifty percent) of the remuneration specified for the original Key Personnel. Any further substitution may lead to disqualification of the Applicant or termination of the Agreement and shall be	(i) Is this can be relaxed for some extremely unavoidable cases.	This is a hypothetical question. And doesn't need any clarification as such.  However, any unique case would be judged on its own merit.

		considered as a breach of Agreement.		
11	EY	22/ 2.17 Substitution of Key Personnel (2.17.3)/ 2.17.3 Substitution of the Team Leader will not normally be considered and may lead to disqualification of the Applicant or termination of the Agreement and shall be considered as a breach of Agreement.	Will incapacity or due to health Clause as for other Key personnel applicable here	This would be covered under Force Majeure.
12	EY	23/2.21 Commencement of assignment/ The Consultant shall commence the Services within 3 (three) days of the date of the Agreement or such other date as may be mutually agreed.	Consultant should get at least 3 weeks to commence the services	Not change
13	EY, Grant Thornton, Deloitte, IPE Global, PWC	22/ 2.18 Indemnity/ The Consultant shall, subject to the provisions of the Agreement, indemnify the Ministry for an amount not exceeding 3 (three) times the value of the Agreement for any direct loss or damage that is caused due to any deficiency in services.	(i) It is requested to modify the clause as follows: Indemnify the Authority for an amount not exceeding the value of the Agreement for any direct loss or damage that is caused due to any Deficiency in services.  (ii) Request, to please reduce the value to 1(one) times instead of 3 times.  (iii) Change requested: We request you to kindly change the clause to limit the amount to one time the fees paid to the consultant	Not change.
14	EY, Grant Thornton	23/ 3.1 Evaluation of Technical Proposal / 3.1.2 Each Key Personnel must score a minimum of 60% (sixty per cent) marks except as provided herein. A Proposal shall be rejected if the Team Leader scores less than 60% (sixty per cent) marks or any two of the remaining Key Personnel score less than 60% (sixty percent) marks. In case the	(i) We request you to consider allowing at least 10 working days for replacement of key personnel.	(i) As per Clause 2.17 of the RfP document.



		Kindly refer table on page 24	<p>we believe the approach and methodology should be given Greater weightage. Hence request you to consider a revision on the scoring criteria as follows: Relevant Experience of the Applicant :30 Proposed Methodology and Work Plan:40 Relevant Experience of the Key Personnel 30</p> <p>(iii) (b) Given the complexity of the assignment and its strategic policy importance, we believe the approach and methodology should be given greater weightage. Hence request you to consider a revision on the scoring criteria as follows: Relevant Experience of the Applicant:30 Proposed Methodology and Work Plan:40 Relevant Experience of the Key Personnel:30</p>	mentioned at Clause 3.1.3 of the RfP document.
15	EY	Schedule-1/ Data Collection and Methodology-sampling	<p>Need further clarity to build our approach and methodology Please clarify the sampling size for selection of state/districts, households/stakeholders/beneficiaries under each scheme. Please clarify, is the cost of the sample is included in the project or would be paid in addition to the project cost.</p> <p>We hereby request the department that the choice of households, 6 out of 10 benefitted and 4 out of 10 not benefitted, might lead to biased sampling. It is suggested that the 10 households be selected on a random basis</p> <p>Request further elaboration to have better understanding.</p>	<p>To be carried out as mentioned in Clause-4, Terms of Reference of each Scheme of the RfP document.</p> <p>To be carried out as per the sample size indicated in the ToR of each Scheme.</p> <p>The qualifying criteria is mentioned at Clause 3 of the RfP document will be considered.</p>
	Grant Thornton	<p>Household Surveys - A selected sample of household surveys shall be conducted to assess the beneficiary-level impact of the scheme. However, this household survey design may be quasi-quantitative in nature.</p> <p>35/ Schedule-1/ Time Schedule/ Agencies will be assessed based on the background and experience of the firm/organization/consortiu</p>		

	<p>Selected Applicant has one Key Personnel, other than the Team Leader, who scores less than 60% marks, he would have to be replaced within 2 working days during negotiations, with a better candidate who, in the opinion of the Ministry, would score 60% (sixty per cent) or above.</p> <p>3.1.1 In the first stage, the Technical Proposal will be evaluated on the basis of Applicant's experience, its understanding of TOR, proposed methodology and Work Plan, and the experience of Key Personnel. The technical Proposal of only those applicants shall be examined who have qualified the basic criteria of applying for this bid as elaborated in "Conditions of Eligibility". The Technical Scoring shall be done by a Technical Committee which shall invite all the eligible bidders for a presentation in front of the Technical Committee. Applicant will be allowed to explain their proposal submitted online at the time of presentation. The Core team that shall be involved with the project should be available at the time of presentation either physically or through web mode. Only those Applicants whose Technical Proposals get a score of 60 (sixty) marks or more out of 100 (one hundred) shall qualify for further consideration, and shall be ranked from highest to the lowest on the basis of their technical score (ST).</p>	<p>(ii) We request reducing the qualifying marks to 50. The clause may be modified as under: Evaluation of technical proposals: Only those Applicants whose Technical Proposals get a score of 50 (fifty) marks or more out of 100 (one hundred) shall qualify for further consideration.</p> <p>(iii) (a) Given the complexity of the assignment and its strategic policy importance,</p>	<p>(ii) &amp; (iii) No change is contemplated in the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>(iii) a &amp; b, The evaluation will be done as per the scoring criteria</p>
--	---	--	---



		<p>m, background and experience of the project team, proposed approach and methodology for the project, and an in-person presentation to the Bid Evaluation Committee.</p> <p>Deliverables and Timelines</p>	<p>(i) Given the pan-India nature of assignment and requirement for primary field visits to multiple states, districts, blocks and villages for extensive interviews and data collection, we feel that time provided for data collection and analysis is very limited. Further, it may not possible for Key Personnel to carry out these discussions themselves given limited time available and multiple geographies to be covered. We request you to kindly extend the duration of assignment to 6 months. (ii) Kindly clarify whether T+100 days mean calendar days or normal working days.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
	EY, KPMG, PWC			
	EY	<p>Data Collection Methodology: Key Informant Interviews &amp; Focus Group Discussions</p>	<p>Please clarify, there will be logistical arrangement would be required to ensure absolute participation during FGD and how the same will be reimbursed</p>	<p>No Logistics support would be provided. However, entry to particular institution would be facilitated.</p>
	EY	<p>147/ Schedule-1/ C) a. iv Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality/ Use of mobile-based real-time data collection and validation tools should be done to ensure efficiency and accuracy in data collection.</p>	<p>As per the standard industry practice, telephonic verifications and back checks are limited to few questions in the questionnaire where unique answers are expected. Please clarify.</p>	<p>C) iii &amp; iv, To be decided by the Nodal Person of each scheme with written clarification.</p>
		<p>C) a. iii Mechanisms to ensure Data Quality 100% data collected should be validated using a validation checklist. Missing data points should be recollected.</p>	<p>We will give our best efforts to collect all the data points during the survey/FGD, however our experience shows that some participants may choose not to respond to particular questions/data points due to lack of awareness or knowledge on that particular</p>	

			subject or unwillingness to answer because of personal reasons. Typically, such instances are not classified as missing data points.	
16	EY	95/ 7.2.3 Encashment and appropriation of Performance Security/ The Ministry shall have the right to invoke and appropriate the proceeds of the Performance Security, in whole or in part, without notice to the Consultant in the event of breach of this Agreement or for recovery of liquidated damages specified in this Clause.	It is not clear, Request for some more clarity on the same.	This would be governed in accordance with the instruction given under GFR 2017.
17	EY	176/Appendix III D-Output- Outcome framework / Output-Outcome framework- For all 5 Centrally Sponsored Scheme under MSDE	Given Output-outcome framework is indicative or applied for all schemes, kindly clarify	It is applied for all six Schemes as per RfP
18	IPE Global	Section 2 Clause No. 2.1. Page No. / INSTRUCTION TO APPLICANTS Scope of Proposal	Kindly clarify if an applicant leading a bid for any one Scheme can become a sub-partner to bid for other Scheme.	Only one lead firm can bid for one or more scheme but it cannot be a sub partner in another scheme.
19	IPE Global	Section 3 Clause No. 3.1.3 Page no. 23-24 / CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION  The scoring criteria to be used for evaluation shall be as follows:	Although it is mentioned that the non-core team will not be evaluated in Clause No. 2.1.4 under Section 2, but under Section 3, 20 marks have been allotted to Non-core team deployment as per the scheme requirement. Kindly clarify.	Evaluation would be done as per Clause no 3.1.3 of the RfP document.
20	IPE Global, Deloitte,	Section 3 Clause No. 3.1.4 Page no. 24-25 / Eligible Assignments	With regard to "Eligible General Assignment", we understand that for the Applicant, on-going projects are taken into consideration with condition of receipt of Professional fees of at least Rs. 50 lakh.  We would request the client to kindly consider on-going projects for the "Eligible Specific Assignment" as well.	Completed projects for both Eligible General Assignments and Eligible Specific Assignment will be taken into consideration.



	Grant Thornton		We hereby request the department to kindly allow repetition of assignments under both General and Specific assignments	Not accepted. Pls check Note at Clause no. 3.1.4 of RfP document.
21	Vision EIS Consulting Pvt. Ltd.	Financial Proposal	We understand this is a value for money solution for the set of terms of reference therefore, request you to kindly indicate a financial slab for each Scheme.	The prescribed annual turnover of 50 crores is applicable to the main bidder irrespective of bidding for one scheme or more scheme.
22	Vision EIS Consulting Pvt. Ltd.	21/ 2.16 Performance Security/ 2.16.1 An amount equal to 10% (ten per cent) of the Financial Bid Value (for each of the Scheme for which Applicant has bid) shall be provided in form of Bank Guarantee by the Selected Applicant.	We request you to consider retaining the performance security at the rate of 2%-5% to avoid financial burden on the consultant.	No change
23	Vision EIS Consulting Pvt. Ltd.	22/ 2.17 Substitution of Key Personnel/ 2.17.1 Ministry reserves Such replacement should be provided by the selected Applicant within 15 days of the notice period given by the Ministry	We request you to provide minimum of 30 days for new replacements, as recruitment and selection process takes some amount of time.	As per Clause 2.17 of the RfP document
24	Vision EIS Consulting Pvt. Ltd.	23/ 3.1.3 The scoring criteria to be used for evaluation shall be as follows/  1. Relevant Experience of the Applicant	(i) Please provide marking Breakup per project for e.g. how many projects does the consultant need to provide to score full. (ii) Please inform whether the consultant has to give eligible specific assignment or eligible general assignment. (iii) We request you to allow ongoing projects which have been substantially completed for evaluation purpose.	5 or more schemes will be treated as optimal and marking would be on pro rata basis.
25	Vision EIS Consulting Pvt. Ltd.	95/ 7.2.2 Liquidated Damages for Delay/ In case of delay in completion of Services, liquidated damages not exceeding an amount equal to 1% (one per cent) of the Financial bid Value per week...	We request you to revise it to 0.05% of the Financial bid value.	Not Accepted
26	Sambodhi	Central e-procurement	Please refer to the image	For all the 6 Schemes

		portal Work Item Details/ Tender value in Rs 1,20,00,000/- <a href="https://eprocure.gov.in/eprocure/app">https://eprocure.gov.in/eprocure/app</a>	attached below. The Central procurement portal where this RFP document was published mentions that the tender value is Rs 1,20,00,000/-.  We wanted to understand if the above-mentioned value is allocated for Evaluation of all the 6 Schemes together or Rs 1,20,00,000 is allocated for evaluation of one Scheme.	
27	KPMG	16/2.3.2/ The Consultant shall not accept or engage in any assignment that would be in conflict with its prior or current obligations to other clients, or that may place it in a position of not being able to carry out the assignment in the best interests of Ministry.	We request you to please elaborate on definition of potential conflict of interest.	As per discussion in pre-bid meeting disclosure has to be submitted to this effect.
28	KPMG	17/2.8/ Right to reject any of all proposals	We request you to please clarify whether MSDE plans to allocate only a certain number of proposals to an applicant. If yes, what is the upper limit to apply for the Schemes.	The criteria for number of proposals is mentioned at Clause 2.4 of the RfP.
29	KPMG	20/2.14.2 (i)/ All the costs associated with the assignment shall be included in the Financial proposal. These shall normally cover remuneration for all the personnel (resident, in field, office etc.), accommodation, air fare, equipment, printing of documents, surveys, geo-technical investigations etc.	We understand the nature of this assignment and owing to the specificities of the RfP, we request you to kindly share any indicative budget earmarked for evaluation of each of the 6 schemes	So far the budget has not been allocated Scheme wise and hence it is not possible to share.
30	KPMG	24/ 3.1.3 (3)/ Relevant experience of the key personnel  The remaining 70% shall be awarded for the comparative size and quality of eligible assignments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We request you to elaborate on parameters to be used to evaluate the "Quality of eligible assignments"</li> <li>It is requested to share the component wise break-up of 70% weightage assigned to comparative size, quality of assignments.</li> </ul>	To be evaluated as per the scoring criteria mentioned at Clause 3.1.3 of the RfP document.
31	KPMG	25/ 3.1.4/ Provided that the Applicant firm claiming credit for an Eligible General Assignment shall	Please clarify in-case of engagements undertaken by Key Personnel during their previous employment, what	The applicant shall submit the details as per Appendix-I, Form-9 of RfP.



		have received professional fees of at least Rs. 50 (fifty) lakhs for such assignment, and where credit is being claimed by a Key Personnel, she/he should have completed the relevant assignment.	supporting documents would be required.	
32	KPMG	167/ Appendix-I Form-9/ Eligible Assignments of Applicant	Please confirm whether applicant can submit assignments of sister- concern entities to fulfil the requirements of eligible assignment of the firm (Form-9)	The Lead Firm/Member should submit the application.
33	KPMG	31/ ToR 2.b.v/ 40/ToR 2.b.v/ To access the intended and actual convergence of the scheme to other developmental programmes of the Central and the State Governments as well as with private sector, CSR efforts, international multilateral and bilateral aid, etc.	Please clarify whether the convergence has to be studied under same umbrella or it can be linked with other umbrella schemes.	As mentioned in the ToR of every scheme.
34	KPMG	33/ ToR 3.a.xiii/ 42/ToR 3.a.xiii/ Putting in place appropriate IT hardware and application software for data collection and management	It may be clarified whether MSDE has existing tie-ups with any such service provider or it proposes to enter into such agreement. This will help us in providing our financial proposal accordingly	MSDE has no tie-ups with any such service provider.
35	KPMG	33/ ToR 4.a/42/ToR 4.a/ Key Informant Interviews & Focused Group Discussions	It has been proposed to cover opinion makers at village level through both KIIs and FGDs. It is requested to clarify the usage of one of these methods for the opinion makers at village level	To be carried out as per Clause 4 a of the ToR of every Scheme.
36	KPMG	16/2.3.2/ The Consultant shall not accept or engage in any assignment that would be in conflict with its prior or current obligations to other clients, or that may place it in a position of not being able to carry out the assignment in the best interests of the Ministry	We request you to elaborate on potential conflict of interest. KPMG has been involved indirectly in providing policy level inputs through a different client (DfID, Govt. of UK), to MSDE. Please highlight whether this is a potential conflict of interest as per the RfP contours.	Scope of work to be shared with MSDE.  MSDE to evaluate and confirm any potential conflict of interest.
37	NPC	The Form-5 and Form-7 at Appendix-I of the RfP	Require certificate from the Statutory Auditor whereas the same are already published in the Annual report which are	Original copy of the annual report duly signed by the Company Secretary or Director,

			signed by the Statutory Auditor. Further endorsement of the information by Statutory Auditor is difficult. So we request to consider for submission of the Copy of Annual Accounts (Financial Capacity) and Abstracts of Eligible Assignments as endorsed by Director (Finance) of NPC.	Finance should be submitted.
38	Deloitte	33/ToR Scheme-1/Sampling	<p>There are four zones (East, West, North and South). 2 states to be selected from each zone which totals to 8 states. However, it is stated that "In this way, around 12 states (2 from each zone) will be selected" which is contradicting.</p> <p>Moreover, a disconnect was observed in the sampling methodology provided in the ToRas we assume that the selection of samples needs to be based on the model Govt ITIs supported under the scheme not the districts and the rural areas as specified. Please clarify.</p>	<p>At least 20% (in each State/UT) of the sample size as mentioned in the ToR of each Scheme to be considered.</p> <p>And the extent to which the sample is representative of the entire target population.</p>
39	Deloitte	34/ToR Scheme-1/Mechanism to ensure data quality	50% data should be telephonically verified or back checks to be undertaken. We request the ministry to reduce it to 20% considering the limited time availability for the evaluation. Also, we assume that students (current and past) of ITIs may be from poor background and reaching them again could be a challenge.	No change is accepted
40	Deloitte	42/ToR Scheme-2/Sampling	<p>We understood that there 1227 ITIs supported under this scheme spanning 31 states / UTs divided into 6 zones and 127 samples were selected covering all states / UTs.</p> <p>It is humbly requested to allow us to sample 2 states per zone similar to other scheme evaluations.</p>	20% (in each State/UT) of the sample size as mentioned in the ToR of each Scheme to be considered.
41	Deloitte	76/ ToR Scheme- NAPS/	It is stated that 12 states to be	As per Clause 3



		Sampling	selected and the sample size for different stakeholders is not defined (Apprentices or establishments). Should we assume or will there be any specific sample size? This is required as it will have an direct implication on the pricing	mentioned at page 79 of the RfP document the bidder may suggest their methodology best suited to meet the objective of the evaluation.
42	Grant Thornton	Clause 3.1.3, Scoring Criteria, Clause 3 (Pg No. 24)	<p>We hereby request the department to kindly clarify and define the marks for number of Eligible Assignments of the respective Key Personnel.</p> <p>In addition, we request the department to kindly clarify the term "comparative size and quality of Eligible Assignments"</p> <p>We request the department to kindly clarify whether we are required to propose same or different 5 Key Expert CV's and 8 Non Key Expert CV's for the 6 schemes.</p> <p>We request the department to kindly define the number of Field Investigators to be showcased under each scheme and the marks assigned to each of the 8 Non Key Experts.</p>	The evaluation will be done as per the scoring criteria mentioned at Clause 3 of the RfP document.
43	Grant Thornton	85/Section 2.3 Termination of Agreement for failure to commence Services/ If the Consultant does not commence the Services within the period specified in Clause 2.2 above, the Ministry may, by not less than 2 (two) weeks' notice to the Consultant, declare this Agreement to be null and void, and in the event of such a declaration, the Bid Security of the Consultant shall stand forfeited	<p>We hereby inform the department that the Service Provider must also have the right to terminate the Agreement:</p> <p>i) in the event of non-payment of fees</p> <p>ii) In the event that MSDE fails to abide by the terms of this Agreement.</p>	As per the Government Financial Rules as applicable in this case it is not possible to give the rights as sought.
44	Grant Thornton	92/Section 3.5, Insurance to be taken out by the Consultant, Clause 3.5.1 (d) and 3.5.2 (b) and (c)	We hereby inform the department that the given clauses are not acceptable. The Firm already has applicable	If you are able to meet the requirement as per Clause No. 3.5 of the RfP document, in that case it

			Insurance Policies in place.	is not required.
45	Grant Thornton	92/Section 3.6, Accounting, Inspection and Auditing	<p>We hereby inform the department in case third party/independent auditors are appointed, prior consent of the Firm must be taken since the Firm is also in the same line of business.</p> <p>We hereby request the department to kindly add the given clause as follows: The Consultant shall permit and shall cause its Sub-consultants to permit, the Client and/or persons appointed by the Client to inspect the Site and/or all accounts and records relating to the performance of the Contract and the submission of the Proposal to provide the Services, and to have such accounts and records audited by auditors appointed by the Client.</p>	<p>There is no ambiguity.</p> <p>The Ministry may appoint its auditor to inspect up to one year from the expiration or termination of this agreement.</p>
46	Grant Thornton	Section 3.7, Documents prepared by the Consultant to be property of the Ministry (Pg. No. 92 - 93)/	<p>We hereby request the department to kindly add the given clause:</p> <p>Intellectual Property Rights: The agency shall at all times indemnify and keep indemnified MSDE against all claims/damages for any infringement of any Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) while providing its services under the Contract. In addition, the firm should be permitted to use the IPRs in its deliverables for its purposes post the completion of the project.</p>	<p>This Clause 3.7 of the RfP document may be read in the light of IPR Law.</p>