

Response / Clarification on Issues Raised in Pre-Bid Meeting held on 30.12.2025

Sl. No.	Issue / Suggestion Raised	Response / Clarification
1	Whether the amount mentioned in the para 7. 3. a) i.e. ₹2 Cr / ₹1 Cr / ₹50 lakh threshold is consultancy fee for DPR etc. or the value of conservation works executed.	The work for the amount mentioned in the para 7. 3. a) should have been executed by the Heritage Architect Firm as a Project Management Consultancy(PMC) which includes preparation of DPR, site visits, supervision and other related works.
2	Whether separate empanelment for consultancy and execution is permitted; whether consortium practice allowed	Consortium arrangements are not permitted to safeguard professional accountability.
3	Whether senior architects with long experience with limited/no conservation background are eligible	Empanelment is based on specialised heritage conservation experience, not general architectural experience alone. Eligibility conditions are uniformly applicable to all applicants to ensure technical competence in conservation works.
4	Mandatory conservation qualification in institutions; whether there would be conflict of interest if retired government officials are part of architect firm	The RFP already mandates M.Arch. (Conservation) or equivalent qualification. Retired government officials being part of firm does not automatically constitute conflict of interest, subject to compliance with conflict-of-interest and ethics clauses in the RFP.
5	Turnover relaxation; Concern regarding average turnover clause	Minimum turnover is required to ensure financial robustness and cannot be relaxed. The clause is retained to ensure minimum financial capability and sustainability of empanelled firms.
6	How donor chooses architects; how fees are fixed	Donors will select from the empanelled list based on professional suitability. Fees will be negotiated mutually, with no role of NCF in price fixation.
7	NCF to standardise consultancy fee / DPR cost	Fixing consultancy fees is not permissible under the adopted model, as it would restrict donor flexibility and professional negotiation.