

Project Name: **Development of Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) System in Ranchi**

Agenda: Pre-Bid Meeting for the clarifications on the RfQ Document

Date of Meeting: September 15, 2010

Venue: Office of Chief Executive Officer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi

List of Participants from Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi

1. Mr. Dipankar Panda, Chief Executive Officer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation
2. Mr. Sunil Kumar, Executive Officer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation
3. Mr. Amar Prasad, Public Health Engineer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation

Representatives from Project Management Consultant cum Transaction Advisor (Tetra Tech India Limited)

1. Mr. B.B. Uppal, Advisor
2. Mr. Sudhir Malik, Chief Consultant- Finance, PPP
3. Mr. Ganesh Singh, Deputy Project Manager
4. Mr. Govind M.P, Senior Environmental Engineer
5. Mr. Manu Shankar Malhotra, Financial Analyst
6. Mr. Priyanshu Baliyan, Project Coordinator

The Pre bid meeting was attended by representatives from 11 firms:

1. A2Z Infrastructure Private Limited
2. Global Waste Management Cell Pvt. Limited
3. Gujarat Enviro Protection & Infrastructure Limited
4. Jamshedpur Utility & Service Company Ltd (JUSCO)
5. Jindal Urban Infrastructure Limited
6. KMC Construction Limited
7. KRL Infratech (India) Limited
8. IL&FS Waste Management & Urban Service Limited
9. SMS Infrastructure Limited

- 10. SPML Infra Limited
- 11. Sylvania Green Energy

Points discussed in the meeting are summarized below:

- It was suggested the company desirous of submitting queries even during the meeting could submit their queries in writing.
- The representatives were informed; no verbal queries will be entertained while furnishing the reply unless the queries are made in writing.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause No.	Queries/Suggestions	Response of RMC
1.	6	1.1.3	Provide copy of DPR	DPR to be provided at RFP stage
2.	4	1.1.4	Provide the details of existing dumpsites	To be provided at the RFP stage.
3.	6	1.1.7	Scope of work should be divided into two or more packages	No Change
4.	7	1.1.7.3	Will there be any upfront capital grant be available for the development of project, if yes kindly gives details and bifurcations of the same.	To be provided at the RFP stage.
5.	7	1.1.7.4	User charges to be collected by RMC	User charges to be collected by the private party
6.	7	1.1.7.4	Is it mandatory to utilize existing municipal employee, tools, machinery and equipments available with RMC? What is the condition of tools and machineries.	List and condition of existing collection & transportation infrastructure would be declared at the time of RFP stage. The issue would be fully clarified in RFP document.
7.	7	1.1.7.7	As the project fund is based on the estimated cost of DPR. If there is a revision in the estimated cost the fund should be raised accordingly	The DPR is approved under JnNURM. In case of increase in cost, additional funding would be contributed by the successful bidder.

8.	8	1.2.4	Bid security of 1% of which project cost i.e the project cost as mentioned in the document or the project cost the bidder has calculated will be taken into account.	Bid security of 1% of the project cost as mentioned by the RMC in the RFP document
9.	8	1.2.7	What is the Concession period for the project	Concession period would be declared at the time of RFP stage
10.	8	1.2.7	Technical presentation may be considered only for technical qualification only.	Exact criteria would be given at the time of RFP stage.
11.	8	1.2.7	What weightage would be assigned for technical & financial proposal in the bid stage.	Weightage of technical & financial proposal would be separate. Exact criteria would be given at the time of RFP stage.
12.	8	1.2.7	RMC should specify the negotiation methodology to ensure competitive bidding	Negotiation will be done to achieve best bargain for RMC. Exact criteria would be given at the time of RFP stage.
13.	9	1.3	Extend due date for submission of RfQ	07.10.2010
14.	11	2.2.1(A), 2.2.5(a)	To increase maximum number of consortium members from 3	No Change
15.	11	2.2.2(A)	Ongoing project (similar project as specified in clause 2.2.2) should be given weight age for evaluation criteria.	Ongoing projects will be considered.
16.	11	2.2.2(A)	Request to dilute the technical criteria has been suggested	No Change
17.	11	2.2.2(A) , (B)	1. To reduce minimum equity holding in entity claiming past experience for technical and financial eligibility from 35%.	1. No Change

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In case of consortium, to reduce minimum equity holding of those whose qualification is considered for qualifying from 35%. 3. To dilute net worth criteria from 75Cr. 4. Net worth of the parent company to be considered for calculating Applicants net worth. 5. Whether experience for the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Hazardous waste landfills/ Biomedical waste landfill would be a valid experience. 6. Turnover should be from any project and not mandatory from Solid Waste Management projects as mentioned. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. No Change 3. Net worth criteria reduced to 60 Cr. 4. RfQ already allows it. Refer Clause 2.2.8 for calculating Technical Capacity, Turnover and Net Worth 5. Experience of only design, construction & operation & maintenance of hazardous waste would be considered. 6. Turnover from projects only ISWM projects would be considered
18.	11	2.2.2(B)	To allot separate marks for financial net worth as well beside Technical parameters.	No Change
19.	12	2.2.2(C)	Brick making should be removed from the criteria	The clause is suitably amended. Refer response at S.no. 20.

20.	12	2.2.2(C)	Reduce qualifying experience of O & M of Sanitary landfill, Compost Plant, Brick making plant and other MSW projects.	The clause is now read as 'The Applicant shall, in the case of a Consortium, include a Member who shall subscribe and continue to hold at least 10% (ten per cent) of the subscribed and paid up equity of the SPV for a period of 5 (five) years from the date of commercial operation of the Project, and has either by itself or through its Associate, experience of 2 (two) years or more in operation and maintenance (O&M) of landfill, Compost Processing Plant and other facilities for handling MSW projects which have an aggregate capital cost equal to the Estimated Project Cost.'
21.	12	2.2.3	Can the experience certificates which are desired should be from the Municipal Corporation or sub contractor of a large Collection & Transportation firm certificate will be valid?	Experience certificates from the municipal corporation and/or sub-contractual certificates would be valid. But in case there is a tie between the companies at the RFP stage, the preference will be given to that company having more experience as a direct contractor for a municipal corporation
22.	13	2.2.5	Is SPV formation mandatory	SPV formation is mandatory
23.	13	2.2.5	To reduce minimum equity holding criteria for Lead Member from 35%	No Change suggested
24.	14	2.2.5(iv)	In case of consortium, to reduce minimum equity holding of those whose qualification is considered for qualifying from 35%.	No Change
25.	14	2.2.5(v)	Consortium members to collectively hold	The clause is deleted

			atleast 51% equity for 5 years	
26.	15	2.2.10	Allow foreign firms for joint bidding because latest & better technology is available outside India which is far superior to the existing Indian technologies & moreover they are environmentally safe also.	Foreign firms are allowed to be joint bidders. But for qualifying criteria, entities resident/ incorporated in India would only be considered.
27.	22	2.19.1	Kindly provide the details of the payment mode of the cost of the RFQ document.	Refer Clause 2.19.1 (h) of the RfQ
28.	22	2.19.1	Whether fee of Rs. 10,000 is to be paid for attending pre-bid meeting	Yes
29.	23	3.2 S.No 3 read with Clause 1.1.7.4	% of total MSW brought to the sanitary landfill. Is it the project waste from Compost plant? If not, then it is very low as per Indian waste scenario.	It is not project waste from compost plant. Not more than 20% of the total waste received at the site is expected to go in to sanitary landfill.
30.	23	3.2	What is the distinctive advantage of Brick making and rational for allotting 35 marks for brick making. Why other options such as conversion of Plastic to Granule not considered for evaluation.	Brick making is an example given for processing of construction & demolition waste. Other technologies like plastics processing, paper recycling, etc. will also be given equal weight age. The clause 3.2 is suitably amended.
31.	23	3.2	Is separate certificate required for each parameter, mentioned in the Table under clause 3.2?	Yes
32.	23 & 24	3.2	It is requested to reevaluate the marking system.	No Change
33.	24	3.2.1.3	Preference to be given to those having experience in Bihar & Jharkhand	Yes

34.	42	APPENDIX-II, Clause 2.2.4	Request for modification in POA so that two separate POA are taken, one for Pre Bid and another for Bid Stage	To be considered, if adequate reason is provided.
35.			Does the landfill site selected meets the site selection criteria as per MSW (M&H) Rules, 2000	Landfill site having the required clearances will be made available to the selected party
36.			Can we assume that all necessary clearance/ approvals/NOC have been taken by RMC from relevant authorities e.g. MoEF, Pollution Control Board, Airport Authority of India etc.	All necessary clearance/ approvals/NOC would be taken before start of the project.
37.			Kindly provide the soft copies of the formats.	No soft copies would be provided
38.			Waste characterization is not provided in the RFQ document.	This detail would be provided at the RFP Stage
39.			To allot separate marks for road sweeping	No Change
40.			Elaborate the paragraph of O & M experience	No change
41.			Please allocate the project cost and O&M cost	This detail would be provided at the RFP stage
42.			It appears that "RFQ" is designed to favor one party.	Not agreed (These allegations will lead to the blacklisting of the concerned firm)