

Queries regarding Pre Bid Meeting held for Selection of Agency under Special assistance to States for Capital Investment Scheme for Development, Operations, Maintenance and Management of Tourism Experience: “Orchha A Medieval Splendour”.

**Vide Nit No.: NIT No.: 3291 /MPTB/2025/SA and SYSTEM NO -2025\_MPTB\_425416 dated 21/05/2025.**

Dated 27.06.2025

S.No.	Clause No.	Queries	Reply of queries
<b>I. Submission &amp; Financial Security Concerns</b>			
1	Bid Security Format (Clause 2.1.4 A & 2.1.5)	- Kindly allow EMD exemption for an MSME enterprise like ourselves registered in Single Point Registration Scheme with specialization in this vertical. It honours the intent of the Government of India to promote MSMEs. At the very least, we request that you permit the submission of Bid Security via Bank Guarantee, a standard industry norm, to enhance ease of participation. The current restriction to online portal mode may exclude capable bidders with banking instruments ready.	No Change
2	Additional Performance Security (Clause 2.1.4 c.i)	The requirement to deposit additional security for quotes beyond 15% below the project cost should be reconsidered, especially when project quality is safeguarded through pre-approved makes. This clause may penalize cost-effective proposals without enhancing quality	Refer <b>corrigendum no.</b> 4 Point 1
3	Validity of Additional Security (Clause 2.1.4 d)	Requiring the security to be valid for 10 years and refundable only 60 days post-completion of O&M is disproportionately lengthy and financially restrictive. A more reasonable timeline would ensure balanced risk-sharing between the Authority and	No Change

		bidders. We request the validity be restricted to the Defect Liability Period.	
<b>II. Submission Timelines &amp; Document Handling</b>			
4	Physical Submission (Clause 2.14.1)	The tender lacks a specific timeline for physical submission. We request that hard copy documents be accepted up to three days after online submission, as per Clause 1.4, especially since courier/post is the only viable option for distant bidders.	No Change
<b>III. Financial Eligibility &amp; Evaluation Criteria</b>			
5	Financial Year Inclusion (Page 22–24)	FY 2024–25 audited balance sheets are not yet available. Please allow FY 2020–21 and exclude FY 2024–25 to ensure inclusivity for all compliant firms.	Refer <b>Corrigendum no. 4</b> Point 5
6	Revenue Threshold (Clause 4.4 Subclause 4)	The requirement for Rs. $\geq 4$ Cr. annual revenue in FY 2024–25 is impractical during an ongoing financial year. We request this be reconsidered or be shifted to FY 2022–23 or 2023–24.	No Change
<b>IV. Technical Evaluation &amp; Scoring Mechanism</b>			
7	O&M Experience (Clause 4.4 A(iii))-	The current clause links marks to completion of both one-year and two-year O&M periods for high-value projects. This rigid structure may exclude experienced bidders who have completed several qualifying projects but with slightly shorter O&M durations. We propose allowing marks for number of projects instead of the number of years of O&M of such projects. This revision would: (a) Ensure the evaluation reflects a range of relevant project experience.	No Change

		(b) Encourage participation from firms with proven project execution history. (c) Maintain quality benchmarks without being overly prescriptive	
8	UNESCO Experience (Clause 4.4 Subclause 3)	We request evaluation based on number of projects, not just years of operation, and that both Category 1 and Category 2 projects be permitted. This avoids penalizing companies with broad but varied experience with UNESCO World Heritage sites	No Change.
9	Category 2 Experience Scoring (Clause 4.4 Subclause B)	Currently, even multiple large-scale Category 2 projects yield only 10 marks collectively. We suggest a more scalable marking scheme that proportionally rewards bidders for executing multiple relevant projects, especially in heritage tourism contexts.	Refer <b>Corrigendum no. 4</b> dated point 2
10	Design Evaluation – CSR/SASCI (Page 24)-	We respectfully seek clarification regarding the evaluation of projects based on whether CSR funds were utilized. While it was mentioned during the virtual pre-bid meeting that CSR-backed projects may reflect a greater willingness to contribute, we believe the source of funding should not outweigh the quality, scale, and impact of work delivered. This criterion may unintentionally disadvantage experienced agencies with strong execution records in government or self-funded projects. We request that the evaluation focus on project outcomes and	Refer <b>Corrigendum no. 4</b> point 5

		technical merit, rather than funding structure, to ensure a fair and inclusive assessment.	
<b>V. Scope of Work &amp; BOQ Specific Queries</b>			
11	Live Performance Requirements (Page 30)	The requirement for live shows at three different locations (Rai Praveen Mahal, Teen Dasiyon ki Chhatri, Shiva Temple) needs clarification. Are they required? Are these performances required simultaneously or on a rotational basis? Clear guidance will allow for more accurate cost and logistics planning. Would you also consider the experience to be simulated with holograms?	The idea of live performers was to include some of the skilled cultural performers who would represent the performing arts of the region. Equipment for the three locations have been considered during calculation of project cost. However, all these are not meant to be conducted during all times of the year/ month. Initially these could be seen as an expansion of the static show with higher fee, run on special days or during particular days every month so as to create an interest for those who have seen the static show. This is seen as not only an experience for visitors but also as an employment generation activity for the locals. However, an extended experience simulated using holograms may be proposed in addition to the live performance for enhancement of the show.
12	Potential Revenue Sources (Page 41)	We request greater transparency regarding the assumptions used to estimate potential revenue from this project. As per available tourism data and trends, Orchha receives approximately 4.5 to 5 lakh visitors annually, a mix of domestic and international tourists. With the addition of immersive experiences such as the Light and Sound Show, this number may increase, but revenue projections must still be grounded in practical, data-driven expectations. We respectfully submit that revenue estimation models must be aligned with realistic visitor inflow, seasonality, and local ticket pricing trends. Without visibility into the underlying assumptions -	<p>No Change in bidding parameter.</p> <p>The projections of revenue are indicative only, the bidders are suggested to conduct their own footfall survey, due diligence and calculation assessments before submission of bid.</p>

		such as expected footfall increases, pricing tiers, or O&M costs - it is challenging to structure a financially viable proposal over the 10-year period. We believe that a collaborative revenue share model, as used successfully in other heritage projects, could offer a more equitable and sustainable approach. This would also allow the Authority and the selected agency to align incentives and adapt flexibly to real-world outcomes over the lifecycle of the project.	
13	Revenue Share Model Option	We propose allowing a revenue share model for the O&M period, which is more sustainable and aligns the interests of both the authority and operator.	No change
14	Financial Bid Evaluation Clarity – BOQ File	Please elaborate on how the financial bid will be evaluated. Additionally, we strongly request the final quoted amount be shown clearly in the Excel sheet, to promote transparency and ease of quoting	No change  Please refer clause no. 4.6.5 A and BoQ excel file uploaded submission of Financial Bid
<b>VI. Request for Inclusion in Approved Makes</b>			
15	Warrior Brand – Projector Enclosures-	We request inclusion of Warrior brand enclosures based on the following:- (a) IP65-rated construction and NABL lab compliance (b) Proven use in UNESCO heritage projects (c) Shorter delivery cycles, local Delhi-NCR presence	The brands mentioned are suggested, bidders can provide similar or better specification/ makes.

		(d) Tamper-proof, custom-built designs at competitive cost	
16	JBL Brand – Speakers and Amplifiers	<p>We also seek the inclusion of JBL as an approved make for speakers and amplifiers. JBL, under Harman Professional, is:-</p> <p>(a) Technically advanced, network-ready.</p> <p>(b) Energy efficient with Class-D topology.</p> <p>(c) Widely used in auditoriums, museums, and AV installations.</p> <p>(d) Seamlessly compatible with JBL loudspeakers and boasts strong after-sales support.</p>	The brands mentioned are suggested, bidders can provide similar or better specification/ makes.
17	Can the same bidder apply for both the projects of Orchha under – CBDD and SASCI?	Please clarify this point.	Yes
18	The total contract period is for 10 years plus maximum of 10 months period (Phase 1: Design and Development Period) for all construction activities including as mentioned at Clause 6.4.1. and	We kindly request you to extend the Phase – 1 period of the project to at least 24 months given the volume of large-scale civil construction activities to be undertaken. Also, we request the to increase the Phase – 2 period of the project by 15 years.	<p>Phase 1 period: no change in timeline.</p> <p><b>Phase 2</b> period: Current allocation is 10 years and extendable for another 10 years in phases of 5+5 years. Please refer clause no. 1.1.2- contract period</p>

	Experience Enhancement Activities proposed under 4.4.1. D (d) if any.		
19	Method of selection/evaluation – QCBS – 30:70 (Technical: Financial)	For a project of this nature, where significant technical capability is required on the part of the bidder the weightage under QCBS may be revised to (50:50).	No Change.
20	Experience in Heritage Tourism is mentioned as an eligibility criterion for past projects.	We request the authority to please explicitly outline what constitutes as Heritage tourism.	Refer Clause no. 4.1.1 (under ‘Relevance’ heading). The Authority’s decision on the relevance of the project shall be final and binding on both parties.
21	The Annual Fee shall be increased 7% annually above the quoted first year Annual Fee compounded annually, till the completion of the Contract Period and as spelt out in clause 6.2 (vi) herein below.	It is our suggestion that the rate of compounding charged on annual fee may be revised to either 7% bi-annually or 5% annually. Also we request the waiver of annual fee for the first 2 years.	No Change
22	The final cost of project calculated as per deviations and all factors is	The RFP states estimated project cost to be Rs 22.82 Crore which is different from the DPR. Please clarify this point as well.	Please refer Clause no. 1.1.2, Clause 6.6 in the RFP, Appendix-VIII: DPR Abstract and reference drawing ( <b>PPP Estimates Abstract_01052024.pdf</b> as annexed with the RFP document)

	Rupees 99.69 crores including all contingencies and overheads.		
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--