

# Minutes of Meeting

Held at: PIDC Head office

Dated: 21<sup>st</sup> March 2022

Time: 10:30 am

## Participants:

S. No.	Participants	Designation	Organization	Appearance
1	Zeeshan Khan	Manager (Research & Evaluation)	PIDC	Physical
2	Ms. Beenish Mobin	AM (Analysis & Evaluation)	PIDC	Physical
3	Muhammad Faizan Khan	AM Projects	NIP	Physical
4	Kiran Unar	Sr. Architect	NESPAK	Physical
5	Abid Hussain	Sr. Structure Engineer	Engineering Associates (EA)	Physical
6	Adnan Mubeen	Principal Engineer	Engineering Associates (EA)	Physical
7	Shahzad Ali	BD Manager	IN Consultant	Virtual
8	Miss Naveen	BD Engineer	Asia Consultant	Virtual

Meeting has been initiated with the introduction of Project and PIDC staff, and introduction of Bidder's representatives.

Following discussion took place in the meeting.

S. No.	Quires Raised by Consultants	PIDC Response
1	<u>IN Consultant – Bid Security</u> Bid security should be requested according to PPRA Rules	PIDC accepted to re-consider it due to a clerical mistake. All bidders are required to submit amount of bid security of an amount not less than Rs. 200,000 (two hundred thousand).
2	<u>IN Consultant and EA – Site Personnel</u> Consultants requested to highlight the staffing months for site staff	Consultant may suggest the site staffing requirement based on ToRs. The same is also highlighted on page 39 of RFP. This will also be evaluated on consultant approach in methodology and work plan. However, Resident Engineer will be required during overall tenure of Construction Supervision as per contract agreement.
3	<u>IN Consultant and NESPAK – 16 months cap</u> Consultants requested for clarification of 'note' on page 40 of RFP regarding 16 months cap on construction supervision.	Consultant will remain responsible to conclude the contract in specified time on quoted price under normal circumstances. In case of further extension, both parties will evaluate the conditions and will mutually agree on a decision.

4	<u>NESPAK</u> Consultant requested for clarification on tests, surveys and studies. If cost is included in Consultant Bid price?	Consultant should submit financial proposal based on ToRs. All survey, testing and studies fees requested in ToRs, must be included in their financial proposal.
5	<u>NESPAK</u> Consultant requested for clarification on construction supervision during Defect liability period	It is stated on 'note' on page 40 of RFP that 'services required (if any) during DLP period, should be included in construction supervision cost'.
6	<u>NESPAK</u> Consultant requested for clarification on submission of Completion certificates in evaluation criteria as most of the client are reluctant at providing proper completion certificate.	It's a necessary requirement under Evaluation criteria. Consultants have to submit completion certificate where it is requested under RFP
7	<u>EA</u> Consultant was reluctant on construction supervision formula and requested PIDC to re-think on it because how consultant can pay to site engineers in case of no work at site because consultant's construction supervision invoices can only be generated after contractor's IPC verification.	PIDC is following the same formula in all other projects as PIDC has faced some serious unjustifiable events during monthly payment to consultants. Therefore, PIDC management has decided not to consider monthly payment in future. Consultant's supervision invoices should be linked with contractor's IPC so that consultant will remain liable to conclude the construction contracts in stipulated time. However, reimbursement may be considered to consultant through construction contract if continuous delay occurs in project due to fault of contractor.
8	<u>EA</u> Consultant requested for clarification of Master Planning on 20 acres land.	Consultant have to do master planning on complete 20 acres land however, covered area including all building construction and infrastructure works is in between 3 to 5 acres.
9	<u>EA</u> Consultant inquired about the 20 acres plot, if it in the same route of natural drain from mountain? Because relocating a natural drain will be whole new big project.	PIDC plot is not in the route of natural drain. However, further information will be gathered after topographic survey.
10	<u>NESPAK</u> Consultant requested for clarification on approval authority of EIA	PIDC accepted to re-consider it due to a clerical mistake. Consultant need to conduct EIA and obtain NoC from relevant approval authority.
11	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u> Section A of Regional Experience Page 18 of 81	Due to clerical mistake, this criterion has been revised: "Regional Experience will have 8 marks in total as per below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for each year of experience in same province - (Max. 5 marks)</li> <li>• Additional 1 mark if experience is in same city – (Max. 3 marks)"</li> </ul>

The meeting ended with the vote of thanks to the all participants.