

“PRE-BID MEETING MINUTES/CLARIFICATIONS FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF CONSULTANCY SERVICES “TO IDENTIFY INDUSTRIAL SECTORS WITH HIGH EXPORT POTENTIAL AND PREPARE AN ACTIONABLE PLAN INCLUDING SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS TO ENHANCE THEIR COMPETITIVENESS AND FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES”

Pre-Bid meeting for the procurement of Consultancy Services “To identify industrial sectors with high export potential and prepare an actionable plan including specific interventions to enhance their competitiveness” was held on 13th Jan, 2025 at 11:00 AM at PIDC Regional Office, Sector F-5/1, Islamabad.

The meeting was attended by the following:

1. Mr. Rizwan Ahmed Bhatti Chief Executive Officer	PIDC	
2. Mr. Jawad Imtiaz Manager	PIDC	
3. Mr. Faizan Khan Asstt. Manager Projects	PIDC	(Online)
4. Engr. Asfand Qureshi Electrical Engineer	PIDC	
5. Ms. Jawaria Anum Research Associate	PIDC	
6. Mr. Ali Salman Executive Director	Prime Institute	(In person)
7. Mr. Kashif M. Sehgal Consultant	I-Consult	(In person)
8. Mr. Umer Farooq Associate Advisory Analyst	PACRA	(In person)
9. Ms. Syeda Asna	KPMG	(Online)
10. Mr. Moiz Ahmad	KPMG	(Online)
10. Mr. Hassan-ul-Haq	KPMG	(Online)
11. Mr. Shahroze Walji	KPMG	(Online)
12. Mr. Sohail Akbar	EY	(Online)
13. Mr. Ali Raheel	EY	(Online)
14. Ms. Fizza Batool	IPSOS	(Online)
15. Mr. Ahmad Khawar	SDPI	(Online)
16. Mr. Zia-ur-Rehman	HLB Advisory	(Online)

Mr. Rizwan Ahmed Bhatti, CEO PIDC, welcomed the participants and briefly informed about the project background and opened the forum for any questions/ queries related to RFP of Consultancy Services to identify

industrial sectors with high export potential and prepare an evidence based actionable plan that can be implemented through suitable Government interventions leading to tangible results. In response to a question, it was explained that an international firm/partner is not mandatory but can be associated for a good quality study. It was emphasized that the team associated with the study should have very solid credentials.

In response to a query received earlier through an email from KPMG regarding equivalence of FCA and CA certifications, PIDC clarified that qualification criteria is clearly mentioned in RFP of the study where persons of accounting background may be helpful but cannot replace other skill sets.

It was emphasized that the actionable recommendations from the consultant should take into account the constraints imposed by IMF program and FBR revenue targets etc, and the focus should be on a roadmap that can be practically implemented within those boundaries.

Following queries / observations raised by the participants of the Pre-Bid meeting and response thereof from the PIDC is appended as below:

S.No.	Queries/ Observations	Response of PIDC:
The Prime Institute		
<u>(In the pre bid meeting)</u>		
1.	Representative of Prime institute asked about the time period of entire project as there may be delays due to the approvals.	PIDC clarified that after submission of deliverable from the firm, it is PIDC responsibility to issue its approval at the earliest possible.

	The Prime Institute	
	<u>(Received through an email)</u>	
2.	<p><u>Proposals for Common Facility Centers (CFCs):</u></p> <p>Suggesting CFCs at a macro level could well form part of the recommendations of the study, however mentioning them as a main component of the scope of work preempts recommendations of the Consultant. However, proposing specific facilities, equipment and services to be included in these centers seems too micro-level.</p>	<p>PIDC is suggesting to consider CFCs as one of the possible tools which may be carefully evaluated while proposing a workable action plan.</p>
3.	<p><u>Innovation and Technology Integration:</u></p> <p>This activity would involve a very deep-down study of the sectors and may not be possible in the time frame for the project. Again, as pointed out above, overall broad recommendations could identify sectors which require to incorporate advanced technologies and broadly what these technologies need to be, however evaluating specific opportunities for integrating advanced technologies and innovation within the identified sectors may be too detailed an exercise.</p>	<p>The consultant will identify which sector requires technological upgrades and provide detailed recommendations for the short list of potential sectors in this regard where needed. Furthermore, examining the existing technology deployed in export sectors of Pakistan and benchmarking against the international best practices should be part of actionable plan. This requires assessing whether</p>

		<p>innovation in raw materials is essential for creating a value-added product or if a technological shift is necessary to drive the transformation effectively. For instance, in the case of Pakistan's textile industry, how this sector can transition from a cotton-based textile products to man-made fibers products.</p>
4.	<p><u>Identification of Private-sector Partners:</u></p> <p>Mandating identification of potential private sector partners within the targeted industries who can collaborate in setting up model units under a Public-Private Partnership mode seemingly assumes that existing units in these sectors may be under-developed and/or sub optimally organized. Such partnerships are usually installed to showcase best practices, advanced technologies and enhanced production methods where these are absent. This aspect may best be left for the study findings to identify rather than be mandated as part of the scope.</p>	<p>The idea is to first see where there are gaps necessitating the introduction of new and better way of manufacturing in a particular sector. After that recommendation may be given to set up model units in a PPP mode.</p> <p>We would expect the study to only identify and indicate important players as possible JV partners in the sector.</p>
5.	<p>Note on Page- 27 indicating that "PIDC reserves the right to conclude the study after Phase-I based on the outcomes and</p>	<p>PIDC is expecting a good quality research study along with practical actionable plan.</p>

	findings. The continuation to Phase-II will be contingent upon the acceptance and approval of Phase-I deliverables” creates an uncertainty for the consultant. PIDC may like to reconsider	However, in the unlikely event of not receiving satisfactory report of phase-I, PIDC reserves the right to conclude the study after phase- I.
6.	<p>The Experts Team Composition requires clarity.</p> <p>I. It is indicated at page 25 that technical team may comprise Industrial Economists, Market Analysts, Policy Advisors, Infrastructure Experts, and Industrial Engineers.</p> <p>II. However, under Evaluation Criteria at Page- 29, the senior team is indicated as Project Manager/ Industrial Policy Advisors, Lead Researcher/Industrial Economist, Senior Researcher/Market Analyst/ Infrastructure & Industrial Experts, Research Assistant, Outreach Officer and Field Officers.</p>	TORs of the study at page 25 outline required skill set whereas evaluation criteria at Page-29 represents team composition.
7.	Financial Soundness criteria at Page 29 (Section- F of Evaluation Criteria Table) indicating that in case of JV/ Consortium/ Partnership, all partners shall have average annual turnover of at least 50 million PKR individually seems	It is agreed that only the lead partner may meet the turnover requirement of PKR 50 million. However, marks will be assigned on aggregate turnover of the JV.

	stringent especially when marking will be done jointly. PIDC may consider relaxing this.	
8.	The Appendix C (C2) indicates that there will be no advance payment. It is requested that this condition may be revisited and mobilization advance may be provided upon signing of contracts to facilitate the service provider to effectively initiate the work, carry out preliminary stakeholder consultations for the long list, and comply with the deadlines of the deliverables	This project is related to consultancy services where mobilization advance is not usually paid and it is not mentioned in the RFP either for this study.
9.	It is requested that a schedule of payment may be provided and linked to the deliverables.	25% of the total payment will be made on the completion and acceptance of phase- I and the remaining 75% on the completion/acceptance of phase-II deliverables. It may be noted that first two deliverables are linked to phase -I and the remaining seven deliverables are linked to phase-II of the study.
I-Consult		
(In the pre-bid meeting)		
10.	Representative of I-consult asked that the time period of 06 months is not sufficient to complete the scope of work defined in RFP as it involves finding	PIDC replied that information regarding traditional sectors is readily available as so many studies have already been

	impediments, technology gaps and proposing potential recommendations	conducted that the consultant would have access to. Main focus of the study would be to build on that and prepare actionable plan for the shortlisted sectors only, for which time period of 6 months is assumed to be sufficient if adequate resources are deployed by the firm.
I-Consult		
(Received through an email)		
11.	<p><u>Eligibility/Qualification Criteria</u></p> <p>The TOR requires the submission of proposals through EPADS and mandates that “in case of a JV, Consortium, or any sort of Partnership, all members must meet the above requirements.”</p> <p>We suggest making this requirement mandatory only for the lead firm. International firms may not have registration on EPADS, and this adjustment would facilitate their participation.</p>	The registration of only lead firm which is to submit the bid is mandatory on EPADS.
12.	<p>Documentary Proof of Project Completion</p> <p>The section requires “documentary proof of project completion/in-hand issued by</p>	It is already mentioned in RFP document:

	<p><i>the relevant clients.”</i></p> <p>We propose that in the absence of a completion certificate, alternative evidence such as a copy of the final report, an email from the client, or other verifiable documentation be considered acceptable proof of completion.</p>	<p>a. For Completed projects - provide completion certificate or contract along with final settlement.</p> <p>b. For On-going projects since 2024 only – provide performance certificate or letter of award/contract along with latest communication</p>
13.	<p><u>Turnover Requirements</u></p> <p>The TOR specifies the submission of audited accounts to verify the turnover requirement of Rs. 50 million for both JV partners. Given that international firms may be reluctant to share their audited accounts, we recommend removing this requirement for international partners in a JV. Instead, the turnover requirement for the lead firm could be increased to Rs. 100 million to ensure adequate capacity.</p>	<p>Furthermore, regarding the query of turnover requirement, it is addressed earlier in the reply of serial no.7. Audited statements of lead partner would suffice.</p>
<p>EY</p>		
<p><u>(In the pre-bid meeting)</u></p>		

14.	Representative of EY suggested to allow the firm to identify specific sectors and associated cost involved in hiring an expert team for those short-listed industrial sectors instead of making a long list of potential sectors first.	The successful firm would be at the liberty to make its own strategy plan for the deliverables of the study. The short list of existing and un-explored industrial sectors cannot be prepared without first identifying the long list of potential sectors.
15.	Representative of EY asked to elaborate the deliverables that are linked to Phase-I & Phase-II of the study.	PIDC responded that the scope of Phase-I and Phase- II is well documented in RFP of the study.
16.	Representative of EY asked, can the cost of purchasing the already conducted study on similar subject be included in the bid.	PIDC replied that cost estimation is done by bidder so all the components of cost including cost of purchasing an existing study or other proprietary material should be taken into account before making a bid.
17.	Representative of EY asked to elaborate the players on the PPP advisory section of the RFP.	Similar query is addressed in the reply of serial no. 4.
18.	Representative requested if PIDC can share the threshold amount of Budget for the research study.	PIDC replied that we are expecting a good quality research study along with practical actionable plan. As such, we have not capped the cost at this moment.


Jawad Intiaz

(Manager, Regional Office)