WORLD EXPO – 2025

<u>Subject</u>:-Request for Proposal for selection of agency for providing Conceptual Design, Scenography And Architectural Supervision for the India Pavilion at World Expo 2025, Osaka. Replies to queries raised for RFP uploaded on 13.12.2023.

| S. | RFP Reference | Query | ITPO's Response |
|-----|--|---|--|
| No. | | | |
| | A. Arcop Associates Private Ltd. | | |
| 1 | Page no. 50-51 2.12 Data Sheet (3) Tender fee Rs.5,900/- incl. GST @18% (4) Earnest money Rs.10.00 Lakh | We request your good self to kindly consider / accept our already submitted EMD and the Tender Fee, both paid online (submitted with the annulled tender), against the new tender. Alternatively, if it is not possible to consider / accept those against this tender, in that case please refund the same at the earliest, so that we can use the same funds for submitting alongwith the new tender. | Since EMD is refundable and previous RFP has been canceled, EMD already deposited can be considered for fresh RFP. The bidder/s are advised to enter detail of EMD already deposited along with the technical bid. However, Tender fee has to be deposited again and nondeposition of same shall cause disqualification of the bidder. |
| 2 | Page no. 50-51 | We request to reduce the Performance Guarantee to 2.5% of bid | No change. |
| | | value because Security deposit of 2.5% of bid value is also being | Only |
| | 2.12 Data Sheet | taken. Otherwise, it may be a huge financial burden to the bidder. | performance |
| | (5) Performance Guarantee - (Five percent) 5% of Bid Value | | Guarantee @5% |

| | | | | | | of bid value is to be deposited. No security deposit will be deducted. |
|---|-----------|---|--|---|---|---|
| 3 | Page n | o. 49 | | | We understand this clause is contradictory. Please review and clarify. | In Timeline column now to be read as "From |
| | S. No. | Deliverable (s) | Timeline | | | the date of acceptance of |
| | PAR | T B : Programme Mana and Conte | nts | | | deliverables under Part A - |
| | 6. | 6. Stage 2: Execution Monitoring and Handholding Support Part B - Stage 2 up to Completion of World Expo, Osaka (i.e. 31st October 2025) | | | | Stage 2 up to Completion of World Expo, Osaka (i.e. 31st October 2025)" |
| 4 | | o. 50-51 ment Terms | | | Payment terms are very stringent. We request you to kindly relax the payment terms; otherwise the payment of the consultant will get stuck and he will be under the financial crisis. | No change |
| | S. No. | Deliverable (s) | Payment S | chedule | | |
| | P/ | ART A: Concept Design | and Architectural Sup | ervision | | |
| | 8 | Part A Stage4:Architectural Supervision Stage | of Scope equated payments deliverable per subabove | es for Part A —spread as quarterly over the etimeline as esection 8 oted fees of Scope — To esed after | | |

| PART | B: Programme Management f Part B — Stage 2: Execution Monitoring and | 40% of Fees for Part B | | | | |
|------|---|---|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| | Handholding Support | module or sub-component) of Scope —spread as equated quarterly payments over the deliverable timeline as per sub-section 8 above. | | | | |
| J | o. 50-51 vment Terms | | Manager completi | this clause, the payment against ment for Exhibits and Contents will on of the engagement of the vendinit is not possible to work as there | be made after the or. On this payment | No change |
| S. | Deliverable (s) | Payment Schedule | | on the consultant, which can effect th | • | |
| No. | | | | nt. Therefore, we propose that the pa | yment shall be made | |
| PART | B: Programme Management f | | as follow | | | |
| 9 | Part B – Stage 1: Ideation, | | S. No. | Deliverable (s) | Payment | |
| | Deliberation and | | D45 | | Schedule | |
| | Engagement | per the cost of | | T B: Programme Management for Exhi | | |
| | | module/sub- component for which | 1. | Part B – Stage 1: Submission of | 20% | |
| | | engagement of vendor | 2. | Concept Design Part B — Stage 1: Approval of | 20% | |
| | | is completed. | 2. | Concept Design | 20/0 | |
| | | , | 3. | Part B – Stage 1: Prorate as per the | 20% | |
| | , | | | cost of module/sub-component for | | |
| | | | 1 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | which engagement of vendor is | | |

| 6 | Page r | no. 51 | | We request that the expenses for lodging, boarding, local travel, food | No change |
|---|--|---|---|--|------------|
| | 11. Fie | eld (International) Trips and other Expenses | | etc. shall be reimbursed on actual basis or it may be arranged by ITPO. | |
| 7 | ii. and w sites of by ITF provid class a expen inclusi deploy memb | Travel, Accommodation and Other Reimburhen required, ITPO may deploy the members of World Expo. All expenditure in this regard so to The tickets will be paid on actual. The Appled a total of 15 business class air tickets and reair tickets during the term of assignment. To sees (including lodging, boarding, local travel, twe) during the period of travel, the member were will be paid a per diem of US \$500 per the period of travel, the member of the period of travel, the period of travel, the member of the period of travel, the period of travel, the member of the period of travel, | s of PDMA at hall be borne gency will be rest economy cover other food etc. all rs of Agency day for one | 12. Minimum Qualification Criteria: | No change |
| ′ | _ | inimum Qualification Criteria: | | 12. William Qualification effectia. | 140 change |
| | | | | | |
| | S. No. | Minimum Qualification Criteria | Document | We request that the ongoing projects where minimum 80% works has been completed at site may also be considered as qualifying | |
| | 4. | Bidder should have completed at least one assignment in planning, conceptualization and design detailing of large scale national / international level exhibitions or projects in the last ten years (i.e. assignments completed on or before 30th November, 2013 will not be eligible) with project or exhibition value of more than Rs. 100 Crores in each case. The value of executed work shall be brought to current costing level by enhancing the actual value of work at simple rate of 7% per annum; calculated from the date of completion to last date of previous month of receipt of tender. | Form 3C | has been completed at site may also be considered as qualifyin project. | |

| Page no. 52-53 13. Technical Evaluation Parameters | | | | | | 13. Technical Evaluation Parameters | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|--|-----------|--|------------------|------------------|---|------------|
| S. No. | Evaluation | Min. Marks | Max. Marks | Criteria for marking | S. No. | Evaluation Parameter | Minimum Marks | Maximum Marks | Criteria for marking | |
| No. | raiametei | IVIAIRS | IVIGINS | IIIai Kiiig | 1 | Experience of Bidder | | 30 | | |
| 1 | Experience of Bidder | | 30 | | 1(b) | Experience of | - | 10 | 5 marks for | |
| 1(b) | Experience of completed assignments in planning, conceptualization, and design detailing of One(1) international level exhibition pavilion or museum. | - | 10 | 5 marks for each Exhibition experience, subject to a maximum of 10 marks | | completed assignments in planning, conceptualization, and design detailing of One(1) international level exhibition pavilion or museum. We request that the ongoing projects where the design works has been completed and construction work is in progress at site may also be | | | each Exhibition experience, subject to a maximum of 10marks | |
| Раде | no. 58 | | | | 16 Co | considered. mbined and Final Eva | luation: | | | No change |
| | ombined and Final Eval | uation: | | | | final selection of th | | uld be based | I on combined | 140 change |
| | ne final selection of | | y would | be based on | | luation of technical (1 | | | | |
| | mbined evaluation of t | | | | | Cost Based Selec | • | | | |
| | rough Quality and Cos | • | • | • • | | ghtages allocated to t | | - | _ | |

| | with following weightages allocated to technical and financial scores: • Technical–70% • Financial–30% | Technical – 7080% Financial – 3020% We request for the above change to enable the best design to get selected. Otherwise, some low quoting bidder may get selected and might not be able to perform upto the desired expectations of such a project of international repute. Similar evaluation criteria are being followed mostly in all the consultancy tenders these days. | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 10 | Page No. 66-67 3.9 Liquidated damages / Penalty 3.9.1. If the selected Agency fails to complete the Assignment, within the period specified under the Agreement, the Performance Guarantee is liable to be forfeited in full or part in case of underperformance and undue delays in performance by the agency, besides other action, including blacklisting of the agency as may be deemed fit by the Authority. In case of part forfeiture of Performance Guarantee and if the agency proceeds to complete the assignment, the Performance Guarantee will need to be buffered and restored to the original value | This clause is very unfair. Therefore, we request to delete this clause, as this will put a huge financial burden to the consultant. | No change |
| 11 | Page no. 69 Penalty 4.1.8.1. Penalty: The selected agency has to provide services as per the requirements of the RFP. In case the services rendered are not as per the requirement of the Department which shall be communicated from time to time, the selected agency will have to come up with a solution within a given agreed timeframe failing which maximum of 10% will be deducted from the amount payable. The other form of penalty not mentioned in the RFP or Agreement will be decided by the appropriate authority on case-to-case basis. | This clause is very stringent. We request you to kindly delete this clause because penalty of 10% is very huge. The other form of penalty not mentioned in the RFP or Agreement will be decided by the appropriate authority on case-to-case basis. Kindly clarify the other form of penalties, which are not mentioned in the RFP or delete this clause. | The other form of penalty includes debarring the bidder to apply in ITPO's future tenders in the case of loss of face of ITPO / India because of nonperformance / under |

| 12 | | | performance | |
|----|---|---|----------------|--------|
| 12 | | | | |
| 12 | | | | ected |
| 12 | | | bidder | |
| | General | | The De | esign |
| | | | Presentation | ı |
| | Please clarify whether the Design Presentation is also required to be | pe submitted alongwith the Technical Proposal or not. | from | only |
| | | | technically | |
| | | | qualified bid | ders |
| | | | shall be calle | ed at |
| | | | appropriate | |
| | | | stage and t | there |
| | | | is no need | d to |
| | | | attach the | same |
| | | | with tech | nnical |
| | | | bid. | |
| | | | However Fo | rm3- |
| | | | I at page no | ა. 33 |
| | | | is mandator | y to |
| | | | be filled | and |
| | | | scanned cop | y be |
| | | | attached | with |
| | | | the technica | l bid |
| 13 | General | | Cannot | be |
| | | | considered | |
| | We request that top 3 shortlisted consultants shall be compensation | ated for preparing the Design by paying them Rs. 12,50,000/- to each | | |
| | bidder. | | | |
| | | | | |
| 14 | General | | Cannot | be |
| | We request you to kindly extend the date of submission by one we | eek from the date of issuing replies to the Pre-bid queries. | considered | |
| | . M/s Rajeev SethiScenographers Pvt. Ltd and M/S Space Matte | | • | - |
| | Page no. 58 | The selection criteria defined is 70:30 (technical and financial | No change | |
| | The selection criteria defined is 70:30 (technical and financial | respectively). The selection criteria should be more inclined on the | | |
| | respectively) | technical score. It is thus suggested to increase the technical scoring | | |
| | respectively) | ratio from present 70% to 80% (80:20) (technical and financial | | |
| | | respectively). | | |
| | | i espectively). | | |

| 2. | We would like to request the full name of the consortium having circulars | names of both the partners be published in public announcements and | Shall be considered at appropriate stages |
|----|--|--|--|
| 3. | We would request for right of first refusal on final financial bid to t | the party that scores highest on the technical bid | Cannot be considered |
| | C. Bhumiputra Architecture | | |
| 1. | Page no. 8 | Please confirm if a copy of the Demand Draft has to be attached | Yes scanned |
| | 2.3.1 | along with the technical submission? | copy of DD has |
| | An Earnest Money Deposit ("EMD") should in the form of demand draft issued from any of the scheduled commercial bank or RTGS / NEFT and should be valid for a period of 90 days from the date on which the Bid Validity expires (see Data Sheet), in favor of GM (Works), India Trade Promotion Organization, New Delhi, payable at New Delhi, for the sum as provided in the Data Sheet shall be required to be submitted by each Bidder in accordance with clause 2.5.1. 2.3.2 The Demand Draft in original shall be placed in an envelope and marked as — [EMD for Selection of PDMA] and not to be opened except in the presence of Authority or an evaluation committee constituted by ITPO. Proposals received without the specified EMD will be summarily rejected. | In case of NEFT/ RTGS, we presume that the EMD amount has to be deposited into the bank account mentioned on Pg 15 Under point no. 8. Do we need to attach a receipt of the same along with the technical submission. Kindy confirm. | to be attached and uploaded on CPPP with the technical bid. Yes scanned copy of receipt of amount deposited via NEFT/RTGS has to be attached and uploaded on CPPP with the technical bid. |
| 2 | Page no. 38 Project cost | Pg 41 mentions the project cost to be Rs 300 Cr. Kindly clarify if the project cost shall be considered as Rs 300 Cr | The cost of the project is Rs. 300 Cr. |
| | The tentative project cost is approximately Rs. 350 Crores (including the cost of event management agency, dismantling, contingencies etc.). | and 350 Cr? | |
| | | In case Rs 350 Cr, kindly confirm the breakup as mentioned on Pg 41. | |
| 3 | Page no. 40 | Kindly confirm if the survey agency has to be appointed by | It is in the scope |
| | 6.1.2 | PDMA or will ITPO provide the survey data. | of PDMA and |

| | Detailed Tasks to be Undertaken a) Land Survey and Soil Conditions as necessary for preparation of the concept design. | Kindly clarify if the cost of Survey will be borne by PDMA or ITPO? | charges are to be borne by PDMA |
|----|--|---|--|
| 4 | Page no. 58 Combined and Final Evaluation: The final selection of the Agency would be based on combined evaluation of technical (T) and financial (F) scores through Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) process, with following weightages allocated to technical and financial scores: •Technical–70% •Financial–30% | Request to consider •Technical– 80% •Financial– 20% | No change |
| 1. | With regards to the pre bid query for SELECTION OF AGENCY FOR FARCHITECTURAL SUPERVISION FOR THE INDIA PAVILION AT WORLS submitted EMD in this submission, Kindly, mention the same in the RFP. | · | Since EMD is refundable and previous RFP has been canceled, EMD already deposited can be considered for fresh RFP. The bidder/s are advised to enter detail of EMD already deposited along with the technical bid. However, Tender fee has to be deposited again |

| | F. Frie Design Dut 14d | | and non- deposition of same shall cause disqualification of the bidder. |
|----|---|--|---|
| 1. | EniaDesign Pvt. Ltd. Bidder must have minimum annual turnover of INR 07 crores from the business of providing Consultancy and Other Services during the last 03 years(2022-23, 2021-22, and 2020-21) | To consider average annual turnover for the last three years as 06 crores instead as 07 crores | No change |
| 2. | Page no. 54 The key Personnel are expected to have essential qualifications as required for the assignment and a minimum of 10 years of relevant experience in the field of expertise. | To consider experience of six years instead of ten years | No change |

Sd/-(General Manager) Works Division