



**RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



**Culture, Tourism Antiquities &  
Archives Department  
Government of Sindh**

**May 2021**

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



---

**IMPORTANT NOTICE/DISCLAIMER**

---

This **RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES DOCUMENT** (this **Response Document**) is further to the '*REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL*' (the **RFP**) issued in April 2021 (the **RFP Documents**) and the various queries received from prospective bidders (the **Prospective Bidders' Queries**) in respect of the Competitive Selection Process relating to the Transaction Advisory Services of **Tharparkar Tourism Project**. This Response Document is being circulated by the Culture, Tourism, Antiquities & Archives Department, Government of Sindh (the **GoS**), solely for use in preparing and submitting a Bid for participation in the Competitive Selection Process conducted for the purposes of selection of a Preferred Bidder to undertake the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project. Upon signing of the Consultancy Agreement for the Tharparkar Tourism Project, the Consultancy Agreement will be the final and binding document and any responses set out in this Response Document will not have any effect or be used for interpretation.

*Unless expressly specified otherwise, all capitalized terms used in this Response Document shall bear the meanings ascribed thereto in the RFP Documents.*

This Response Document is not an agreement; its sole purpose is to provide interested bidders with information that may be useful to them in making their Bids pursuant to the RFP Documents. The RFP Documents and this Response Document includes statements, which reflect various assumptions and assessments arrived at by GoS in relation to the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project. Such assumptions, assessments and statements do not purport to contain all the information that each Bidder may require.

None of the GoS' entities and its relevant stakeholders in the Tharparkar Tourism Project (including, *inter alia*, the CULTURE, TOURISM, ANTIQUITIES & ARCHIVES DEPARTMENT, the PPP Unit, the Finance Department, and the CSC) nor, in each case, their employees, personnel and agents etc., make any representation (expressed or implied) as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein, or in any other document made available to any Bidder in connection with the Competitive Selection Process for the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project and the same shall have no liability for this Response Document or for any other written or oral communication transmitted to the recipient in the course of the recipient's evaluation of the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project. Neither these entities nor their employees, personnel and agents etc., will be liable in any manner whatsoever to reimburse or compensate the recipient for any costs, fees, damages or expenses incurred by the recipient in evaluating or acting upon this Response Document or otherwise in connection with the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project.

The assumptions, assessments, statements and information contained in the RFP Documents, may not be complete, accurate, adequate or correct for the purposes of Bids. GoS' entities and its relevant stakeholders in the Tharparkar Tourism Project (including, *inter alia*, the CULTURE, TOURISM, ANTIQUITIES & ARCHIVES DEPARTMENT, the PPP Unit, the Finance Department, and the CSC) and, in each case, their employees, personnel and agents etc. have no liability for any statements, opinions or information provided in the RFP Documents. Each Bidder should, therefore, conduct its own investigations and analysis and should check the accuracy, adequacy, correctness, reliability and completeness of the assumptions, assessments, statements and information contained in the

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**

---



RFP Documents. The Bidders are required to undertake their independent assessment and to seek independent professional advice on any or all aspects of the RFP Documents. No decision should be based solely on the basis of the information provided by the RFP Documents and this Response Document.

GoS expressly disavows any obligation or duty (whether in contract, tort or otherwise) to any Bidder. No Bidder is entitled to rely on GoS' involvement in the preparation of this Response Document or in the Competitive Selection Process as a basis for preparing the Bid or developing the Transaction Advisory Services of Tharparkar Tourism Project.

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



**RESPONSES TO PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
IN RESPECT OF  
THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ISSUED BY THE CULTURE, TOURISM, ANTIQUITIES & ARCHIVES DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF SINDH  
IN RELATION TO THE TRANSACTION ADVISORY SERVICES FOR  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**

*Unless expressly specified otherwise, all capitalized terms used in this Response Document shall bear the meanings ascribed thereto in the RFP Documents.*

<b>QUERIES AND RESPONSES</b>			
<b>SR. NO.</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
01.	The timeline for the phase-1 is too short since to produce five (05) reports in two months will deteriorate the quality of work. It is requested to expand the deliverables schedule to at least 6 months.	The submission timelines for each deliverable can be extended if required subject to approval of Procuring Agency based on justifications submitted by the Consultant.	Clarification
02.	Performance guarantee are applied to contractors only. Waiving off performance guarantee may please be considered. As PPRA rule is silent for consultants providing services.	The SPPRA rule with regards to performance security are also applicable on consulting services.	Disagree
03.	For developing a tourism Master Plan for Tharparkar, it is requested to update on the ground situation so that the consultants are able to develop future intervention in consideration of ground situation.	The ground situation may be assessed independently by each bidder prior to submission of bid.	Disagree
04.	Will the financial proposal be submitted phase-wise in one financial proposal enclosed envelope?	Please refer following sections of the RFP document for clarity:  2.14, 2.16, 2.17, 2.21 and Form FIN-2 Summary of Costs	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



05.	As mentioned in the RFP document, what will be the scope of the documentary whether it will cover the outputs of the feasibility or a general documentary on the "promotion of tourism in Tharparkar"?	Please refer section 5.4.1.1 (A) (iii) as it is self-explanatory for clarity.	Clarification
06.	As per RFP more sites can be added along with the four (04) sites mentioned in the TOR, can you please clarify the expected number of sites that can be included and what will be the financial modalities for incorporating other sites?	<p>During the Tourism Feasibility, the identification of any additional potential tourism sites / activities (other than specified tourism sites/activities) shall be responsibility of the Consultant.</p> <p>In case if such proposal of additional tourism site(s) is approved by the Procuring Agency, the Consultant shall conduct feasibility study for the same and shall stand included in the subsequent terms of reference of the Consultant. During the bid preparation, the bidder consortium in consultation with their tourism consortium member may estimate any additional potential tourism site and include its financial impact in their financial bids accordingly.</p>	Clarification
07.	Payment plan for deliverable may please be considered, payment on inception report or signing of contract will help consultant in mobilization of resources.	Not accepted.	Disagree
08.	<p>Section 5.4.1.2, Sub-Section (i)(a) refers to an EIA being carried out as per national guidelines AND requirements of International Financial Institutions (IFIs).</p> <p>Has any IFI been identified so that we may accordingly understand the scope of work for the EIA and its costing. If so, can it be confirmed if the IFI requires an Initial</p>	<p>The Consultants are clarified that Asian Development Bank (ADB) is the IFI.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Consultant shall conduct an environmental study considering all aspects of the environment, for the Project (based on preliminary project design) that complies with the requirements</p>	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



	Environmental Examination (IEE) or Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) at this stage of the feasibility.	<p>enshrined in the Safeguard Policy Statement 2009 of the Asian Development Bank.</p> <p>It is further submitted for general understanding of the Consultants, that under PPP modality the Concessionaire / Private Party that is subsequently selected by the GoS for implementation of the Project shall be responsible for upgrading / updating the aforementioned study (i.e. the environmental study prepared under section 5.4.1.2) based on final project design for the purposes of acquiring NOC from Sindh Environmental Protection Agency in order to fulfil and satisfy the national / provincial legal and regulatory requirements.</p>	
09.	Section 5.4.1.2 refers to the Environmental Impact Assessment, Social Impact Assessment, Stakeholder Consultations, & Land Acquisition & Resettlement Plan as separate items. Are all of these to be dealt with separately and submitted as separate deliverables, or to be submitted as one report in the form of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment. Although there are social aspects in the Land Acquisition and Resettlement Plan, we believe that it should be treated as a separate document as its scope of work rivals that of the ESIA.	<p>It is clarified that there can be two separate documents i.e. ESIA and LARP. The social impact assessment can be included in the ESIA as a component. Same can be done with Stakeholder Consultations.</p> <p>It is also pertinent that both of these two components i.e. ESIA and Stakeholders consultations should also be the part of LARP, however, in that case these two should be amended as per LARP focusing more on the LAR issues.</p>	Clarification
10.	Section 5.4.1.2, Sub-Section (i)(a) refers to an EIA being carried out as per national guidelines AND requirements of International Financial Institutions (IFIs). Will the Sindh Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and its approval be	Please refer serial # 08.	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



	sought in the feasibility stage also? If so, this will drastically increase the timeline of the EIA.		
11.	We believe that the prescribed bid-submission deadline, i.e. 10th June 2021, does not allow us a sufficient time-frame for bid preparation. Consequently, we wish to seek an extension on the bid-submission deadline.	Bid submission deadline remains the same as per the RFP and advertisement.	Disagree
12.	In the timeline mentioned in the report, the technical feasibility will be due 1.5 months after commencement, and the ESIA report 2 months after commencement. Considering the ESIA report requires the finalization of all other technical items and aspects before the assessment is carried out, 0.5 months is nowhere near enough time for the assessment. The timeline for the ESIA should be extended to at least 3 months after commencement of project.	Please refer serial # 01.	Clarification
13.	It is proposed that the department only identifies sites that it wants developed and not the proposed development. Pre-set developments would impede flexibility in proposing better development plans for the site, by the advisors. All developments should be devised by the experts based on viability of the project.	The Consultants shall follow tourism related terms of reference as given under Tourism Feasibility 5.4.1.1	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



14.	For the experience requirement, can it be specified as to the nature of the feasibility study i.e. financial and technical only?	Experience of relevant consortium member firm shall be applicable for each evaluation criteria. For example:  a) Financial consulting firm will be entitled for financial feasibility experience requirement b) Environmental / Civil Engineering firm will be entitled for EIA studies experience requirement c) Tourism consulting firm will be entitled for tourism feasibility experience requirement	Clarification
15.	Considering that development of Master Plan is one of the requirement of the TORs, no such criteria specifically deals with evaluating experience of developing master plan of the Bidders. Amendments proposed to evaluation criteria	Evaluation criteria shall remain the same as given in the RFP document.	Disagree
16.	Since this project is being undertaken for a government authority, it is being proposed that experience w.r.t development of financial model, risk matrix and project structuring for tourism projects should be for public sector only.	The requirement with regards to financial model, risk matrix and project structuring shall remain the same as given under the RFP.	Disagree
17.	Request to reconsider the Bid Security from 2% to 1%	Bid security of 2% of bid price shall remain the same.	Disagree
18.	The Technical Feasibility Study cover the major portion of the assignment and is weighted at 20%. These milestones should be reconsidered to enable the consultants for getting payments in order to mobilize the team and in lieu of work activities completed as per technical feasibility requirements.	The percentage assigned to the Technical Feasibility (i.e. 20%) shall remain the same, however, keeping in view the extensive scope of work related to Technical Feasibility and payment milestone rationalization, the Procuring Agency may consider to bifurcate 20% of payment amongst three sub-deliverables (i.e. Initial	Clarification



**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



		Assessment Report, Tourism Feasibility and Civil Engineering Feasibility) of the Technical Feasibility.	
19.	In case if private land falls in the project site then who will be responsible for Land Acquisition for the Project?	Government of Sindh shall acquire all the private land that may fall within the project site / ROW.	Clarification
20.	Is Subcontracting allowed?	Subcontracting will be allowed to Consultant subject to approval of the Procuring Agency. Please note as per RFP, the sub-consultant's credentials & experience is not eligible for scoring.	Clarification
21.	If a feasibility study (or any deliverable) for any project that is incomplete and is under process as of bid submission deadline, will it be entitled for scoring?	Only completed feasibility study will be eligible for scoring as mentioned in the RFP.	Disagree
22.	Kindly elaborate the use of word "documentary" w.r.t. page 34, under section 5.4.1.1. (A) (iii) submission of the document in terms of visual communication or in terms of documentation?	The deliverable mentioned under 5.4.1.1. (A) (iii) shall include a video documentary as well as written document.	Clarification
23.	Clarify the role and requirements of tourism experts; also explain the "Related Fields" referred to in the RFP, page 45. Are experienced personnel/professionals in a multi-disciplinary organization that manages/processes tourism projects eligible under this project category, please confirm?	The anticipated role & responsibilities of tourism expert shall include but not limited to conduct tourism feasibility, provide inputs to technical, legal and financial consortium members, give brief / presentations at various Government forums such as Departmental committee, Investor conference, Technical & Financial Evaluation Committee, PPP Policy Board and Cabinet.  "Related Fields" means related tourism sector.	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



24.	<p>Please confirm consideration for this proposal</p> <p>i. What is the scope of work with respect to additional spots based on its location and its impact on rational bid submission? Either they are located in different remote locations and the area to be serviced must affect the scope of work of the project, hence pricing (bid price) as stated on page 34 of the RFP.</p> <p>ii. Elaborate/specify the scope of work with respect to the increase, if required, of additional facilities in various locations; should structural and service provisions affect the scope of work of the project?</p>	Please refer serial # 06.	Clarification
25.	The proposal submission date should be extended by four weeks, from the current submission deadline.	Please refer serial # 11	Clarification
26.	It is proposed that the technical feasibility study duration be atleast six (06) months from 1.5 months as envisaged in the RFP. Moreover, it is important that the technical feasibility is complete and comprehensive in nature which requires substantial amount of time to streamline the project in terms of scale and requirements w.r.t. page 15. Revised / reschedule the payment plan with timeline for submission of atleast 5% payment to justify project technical input of inception report at initial stage or to further expedite as mentioned in RFP pg No. 15.	Please refer serial # 01 and 18.	Clarification
27.	Kindly share pre-feasibility reports, existing surveys or land use plan, if available , as an authentic document to rationalize	The Procuring Agency shall share any available data / information subsequently with the Consultant after signing of Consultancy Services Agreement.	Clarification

**RESPONSES TO  
PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS' QUERIES  
THARPARKAR TOURISM PROJECT**



	project requirements; and put existing data in the loop.		
28.	As per the RFP clause 2.17.1 the procuring agency has requested the bid security to be 2% however, precedent projects have had bid security of 1% so we request you to lower bid security to 1%.	Not acceptable.	Disagree
29.	As per the Scoring system of the RFP document “Experience of feasibility study of a project related to development of tourism by any member of the Consortium (for public sector client), during last fifteen (15) years is 04 projects” however, there has been limited number of projects carried out by the public sector in the tourism sector as the tourism sector in Pakistan is untapped. It is requested to lower the required number of projects to three (03).	Not acceptable.	Disagree
30.	Under section six (06) Evaluation Criteria and Scoring System (B) it is stated that ‘Developed Financial Model for tourism projects under public / private sector’. We would like to highlight that the financial model follows a similar pattern for all sectors therefore the required experience should not be restricted for tourism projects only. Furthermore, in a recent PPP project (under procurement for consultant) of a highly specific and technical nature, the required experience for financial modelling are of generic nature.	The evaluation criteria as per the RFP will remain the same.	Disagree
31.	Will the experience of legal documentation such as EOIs, RFQ, RFP), Concession / PPP Agreements / EPC contracts / agreement negotiations performed for a private party be eligible for scoring?	The experience of drafting procurement documents shall be entitled for scoring.	Clarification