

## INDIAN PORTS ASSOCIATION

### Engagement of a Consultant to undertake ‘Assessment for establishment of Floating Storage Regasification Unit (FSRU) at Major Ports’

Sl. No.	Brief Text of the Clause		Queries	Clarification
	Section No.	Section Head		
M/s ICF				
1.	Para 3, point 3.3	<b>Terms of Reference (Scope of Work)</b>	<p>Historically natural gas demand has played a major role in assessment of viability of LNG projects. This part of scope is very critical since correct assessment of natural gas demand is based on the alternative fuel availability and also competition for the consumer from different LNG terminals located in India. Therefore it is important to consider demand assessment projects (related to India) as also one of the key criteria under QCBS. Currently, no weightage is given on projects related to market assessment.</p> <p>In order to have a correct assessment for shortlisting of ports and the consortium / bidder is capable enough to look into both the aspects of the project.</p>	Clause remains unchanged.
2.	Para 5 Table point No. A	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Past experience and Capacity</li> </ul>	<p>The bidder should have carried out natural gas market assessment studies in multiple geographies of India during last three years</p> <p>Number of assignment done in last 3 years : 5 marks per project – Maximum 30 marks”</p>	Not agreed as the FSRU are proposed to be set up in Major Ports only. Market demand assessment may be indicated by the bidders based on the information available with them through published reports, information on internet, agencies under Ministry of P&NG and the conducted by the bidders themselves.

<b>M/s AGTS</b>				
1.	Para 1 Point 1.2 - (i)	<b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule</li> <li>Pre-Bid Meeting</li> </ul>	As per the clause "Pre-bid meeting at 1130 Hrs on 03/06/2020" appears to be a physical meeting. Request you to kindly hold a Secure Web-based meeting to ensure safety of attendants in the Post-COVID19 lockdown situation.	Refer to Corrigendum -I
2.	Para 1 Point 1.3 & Para 4 Point (B)	<b>Companies /Consortium</b>  <b>Eligibility Criteria</b>	It is noted that the Companies / Consortium can participate in the Tender. AS per 4 (B) the bidder must be Registered in India. Request clarification whether Consortium of an Indian Company with an Overseas Partner (Not registered in India) is eligible to participate without Registration of the Consortium.	As long as, the consortium is a part of the Company incorporated in India, there may not be any issue.
3.	Para 8 Point 8.2 (ii)	<b>Bid Submission</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial proposal</li> </ul>	As per first para of section 8.2(ii) "NO hard copy of the financial bid shall be provided". However, submission of hard copy of proposal is indicated vide paragraph 3 of the section 8.2(ii). We presume that submission of hard copy mentioned vide paragraph 3 of the section 8.2(ii) refers to the Technical Bid only and Hard copy of the financial bid is not required and thereby Annexure-V (format for financial bid on the letterhead of the bidder) is also not required to be submitted in hard copy. Please confirm bidder understanding is correct.	Price bid shall be submitted at CPP Portal only.
4.	Para 5 Table Point No. (B)	<b>Team for the Project</b>	Qualification required for both the Team leader and Project Management expert is ME/MS/M. Tech (Civil Engineering) and BE / B. Tech (Civil Engineering) respectively. It is observed that the qualification is restricted for Civil Engineering discipline only. In view of the project being based on a floating storage system Marine Engineering, Naval Architecture, Offshore Engineering & Mechanical Engineering background may also be equally important. We request to consider qualification from the other disciplines for the above two team members.  Qualification required for Marine expert is BE / B.	Any Engineering discipline may be allowed.

			Tech (Marine Engineering). It is observed that the field of experience should be of the Marine expert is in Bathymetry, Topography, Geotechnical data, Waves and Current data. In view of these experience being achieved after a qualification in Civil Engineering, Offshore Engineering & Mechanical Engineering, such back-ground may also be equally important. We request to consider qualification from these other disciplines for the above team members.	
5.	Para 3 Point No.3.3.	<b>Terms of Reference (Scope of Work)</b>	As per scope of work” Based on the gas market demand assessment, prioritize the major ports where the FSRU can be implemented.....” We understand that market demand assessment is not required to be carried out by the Consultant and relevant data for the same will be shared by Indian Ports Association	Market demand assessment may be indicated by the bidders based on the information available with them through published reports, information on internet, agencies under Ministry of P&NG and the conducted by the bidders themselves.
<b>Ms/ Akhand Technologies</b>				
1.	Para 3 Point No.3.3.	<b>Terms of Reference (Scope of Work)</b>	<p>Pls confirm if IPA has any data available. If not, how IPA will support the contractor to obtain this info. Without any authority and support of IPA, gathering such info can turn out to be more exhausting and time consuming.</p> <p>RFQ emphasizes about the requirement around Major Ports. However, past trend indicates that all projects so far have been projected around other ports i.e. H- Energy @ Jaigarh and Swan Energy @ Jafrabad. Even earlier too, companies had shown interest to set up such units near Kakinada etc and not near major ports.</p> <p>Reasons are –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major ports have lot of traffic and setting up infra around is cost prohibitive.</li> <li>• Ancillary services are also not cost effective and all these put together make the project unviable.</li> </ul>	Clause remains unchanged.

			In view, it is suggested that either IPA considers revises the scope to consider only other ports OR include other ports as well as major ports. Accordingly, IPA shall consider providing additional days to complete the SOW.	
<b>M/s PWC</b>				
1.	Para 5	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation and Selection Process- QCBS</li> </ul>	Given the nature of the study, request you to consider giving more weightage to the Technical score at 80% in QCBS criteria	Clause remains unchanged.
2.	Para 5  Table Point B-(A)	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of Technical proposal</li> <li>Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>Tem Leader</li> </ul>	RFP document mentions requirement for educational qualification as Masters in Civil Engineering. The value add provided by the team leader is with reference to the similar feasible studies carried out. Typically, consultants handling such assignments have MBAs as education qualification and we request you to consider MBA also as sufficient educational qualification for the position of the Team Leader. We understand that the technical education qualification would be mandatorily required for technical roles, such as "Marine Experts".	Considering the technical nature of proposal, the eligibility criteria for Team Leader may not be agreed. Clause remains unchanged.
3.	Para 5  Table Point B-(A)	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of Technical proposal</li> <li>Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>Qualification Experience</li> </ul>	Similar to above, request to consider other relevant education qualifications such as MBAs and equivalents to be considered for Project Management Expert.	Clause remains unchanged.
4.	Para 5	<b>Proposal Format &amp;</b>	The evaluation criteria is currently evaluating only	Clause remains unchanged.

	Table Point B-(A)	<b>Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of Technical proposal</li> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Team Leader Experience</li> </ul>	the number of years of experience, which can be across various domains. We request that the quality of experience should also be allotted weightage in terms of number of relevant projects. Similar request for all other experts.	
5.	Para 9 Point D	<b>Opening of Financial Bids</b>	There are certain profiles such as "Marine Expert" which require highly technical expertise and may not be available with the same Consultant. Given this, we request you to allow subcontracting of certain profiles (e.g. Marine Expert) while the Consultant remains over all responsibility for the engagement.	The marine expert may be brought on the pay rolls of the bidders.
6.	Para 8 Point (i) (d) Annexure-I	<b>Bid Submission</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover-I Technical proposal</li> </ul>	<p>In many engagements, especially with Multilateral clients such as World Bank &amp; ADB, completion certificates are not issued to the consultants. We request to consider self declarations or auditors certificate of payment receipt for such cases.</p> <p>Also, some projects with private clients are confidential in nature. We request to consider self declaration as proof for completion for such assignments</p>	Certificates issued by the MD of the bidders firm along with the statutory auditor certificate of payment receipt will be considered as proof of completion of such assignment may be accepted.
<b>M/s Deloitte</b>				
1.	Para 4 Table Point C	<b>Eligibility Criteria</b>	<p>We would like to bring to the Client's knowledge that as mentioned in Scope of work, Section 3, Point 3.1" Bottlenecks in implementing the FSRU projects",</p> <p>Section 3, Point 3.2 "To identify the gaps, in the existing FSRU policy",</p>	This has already been clarified in column of M/s AGTS above. Clause remains unchanged.

			<p>Point 3.3 “gas market demand assessment” and Point 3.6 “Examine other countries framework/policies related to FSRU”,</p> <p>As per our understanding, the assignment requires experience in market demand assessment, policy analysis, international benchmarking, stakeholder interactions, business planning and development in the port sector, in addition to experience in LNG import and Regasification terminal.</p> <p>We would request the client to consider “gas market demand assessment” as highlighted above to represent the relevant LPG sector experience required in addition to including port development, port business planning, market study for ports to reflect relevant experience for delivering other parts on which are on the lines of Port Policy Advisory</p>	
2.	Para 5 Table Point A (ii)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past experience and Capability</li> </ul>	<p>We would like to highlight a few points from the Scope of Work:</p> <p>“Some of the ports have invited Expression of Interest (EoI). However, the response to the EoIs is not satisfactory. It is important that reasons for such muted response are examined and requisite measures are taken in timely manner”</p> <p>“3.2 To identify the gaps, in the existing FSRU policy, by interacting with existing LNG operations as well as potential FSRU suppliers/investors and suggest changes required in the existing policy to make it more attractive”</p>	Clause remains unchanged.

			<p>“3.3. Based on the gas market demand assessment, prioritize the major ports”</p> <p>The current experience requirement only talks about feasibility assessment of LNG terminal, which is typically a combination of technical assessment of the FSRU, its costs, and projections of financials.</p> <p>Instead, based on the reading of the above scope of work, we believe organizations who have expertise in policy review/drafting and gas market demand assessment are best placed for effective delivery of the assignment. Hence, we would want you to please revise this credential requirement and split it into two parts</p> <p>1 – Port policy advisory/ preparation – 20 marks 2 – Gas Market Assessment - 15 marks</p> <p>A separate credential on gas market assessment will also ensure that organizations who have worked with gas suppliers like GAIL and LNG players in India like PLL and who understand the demand-supply dynamics in India and globally are part of the team.</p>	
3.	Para 5 Table Point B & B (A)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Team Leader</li> </ul>	<p>We note that the requirements in Scope of Work include Section 3, Point 3.2: “interacting with potential FSRU suppliers/investors”,</p> <p>Section 3, Point 3.3: “suggest changes required in the existing policy” and</p> <p>Section 3, Point 3.4: “market demand assessment”, however it does not entail facility/ terminal design element of work, which would require the proposed position to possess technical qualification such as ME / MS / M.Tech (Civil Engineering). However</p>	Clause remains unchanged.

			given the nature of work as highlighted above, we would request IPA to consider MBA as eligible qualification for the proposed position with relevant experience in port sector.	
4.	Para 5 Table Point B (B)	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Financial Expert</li> </ul>	We would like to bring to the Client’s knowledge that the proposed position with the prescribed qualification is expected to be competent to perform “experience in the Government, specializing in Infrastructure, particularly for Public Private Partnership Projects”, stated under the job duties of Project Management Expert. Thus, request the client to consider including PPP experience and consider the position as Finance and PPP expert, in place of Project Management Expert.	Clause remains unchanged.
5.	Para 5  Para 5 Table Point B (C)	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Financial Expert</li> </ul>	<p>Since the Scope of Work does not require the Consultant to engage in terminal planning or construction management, the prescribed job duties along with qualification of BE / B.Tech (Civil Engineering) with Project Management qualification is not expected to be a key technical skill required to deliver the scope of work effectively.</p> <p>Secondly, given the nature of job duties assigned to Financial Expert, as mentioned above in the Query 2, the relevant experience of Finance and PPP expert should be capable of tendering to expected requirements.</p> <p>Also, as mentioned in Scope of work, Section 3, Point 3.2 “To identify the gaps, in the existing FSRU policy”,</p> <p>Point 3.3 “gas market demand assessment” and</p> <p>Point 3.6 “Examine other countries</p>	Clause remains unchanged.

			<p>framework/policies related to FSRU”, such nature of work would require expertise in market demand assessment, policy analysis, international benchmarking among others with qualification and experience in related fields associated with port sector.</p> <p>Thus, would request the client to re-assess the requirement of the proposed position, and replace the same with proposed position of “Port Economist” if deemed fit.</p>	
6.	Para 5 Table Point B (D)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Marine Expert</li> </ul>	<p>We would like to bring to the Client’s knowledge that the nature of experience in “Bathymetry, Topography, Geotechnical data, Waves and Current data.” for the proposed position does not tend to requirements stated in Scope of Work (Section 3, Point 3.1 to 3.6.) However as mentioned in</p> <p>Section 3, Point 3.3 “Prioritize the major ports where the FSRU can be implemented” and</p> <p>Point 3.5 “Identify the Ports, which should not go for LNG/FSRU”, such nature of work would require expertise in port infrastructure assessment and port operations. Thus, we would request the client to reconsider this position as “Ports Infrastructure Expert” with expected experience in port infrastructure development, port business development, port operations, port cargo operations and works of similar nature.</p>	Clause remains unchanged.
<b>M/s Tractebel</b>				
1.	Para 5 Table Point A (ii)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p>	<p>Since very few studies has been conducted in last three years in India therefore, we request you to match this criterion with the following eligibility</p>	Clause remains unchanged.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Past experience and Capacity</li> </ul>	<p>criteria mentioned under clause 4 (C) at page 4 where last 10 years' similar experience considered.</p> <p>“The bidder shall have experience of having successfully conducted Detailed Feasibility Study/Market study for setting up an onshore/offshore LNG Import and Regasification Terminal of 2 MMTPA capacity or above, during the last TEN years, ending the last day of the month to the one in which the tenders are invited.”</p> <p>Both criteria should be same. Please confirm.</p>	
2.	Para 5 Table Point B- (A)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Team Leader</li> </ul>	<p>We request you to relax the experience criteria for TEAM LEADER as</p> <p>(a) &gt; 15 year and &lt;20 years = 10 Marks (b) &gt; 20 years = 15 Marks</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	Clause remains unchanged.
3.	Para 5 Table Point B (D)	<p><b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</li> <li>• Team for the Project</li> <li>• Marine Expert</li> </ul>	<p>It is observed that field of experience for Marine expert is in Bathymetry, Topography, Geotechnical data, Waves and Current data measurement. Since these experiences being achieved after qualification in Civil Engineering Or Ocean Engineering also and expert of such background may also be equally important. Hence, we request IPA to consider qualification of B.E./B.Tech. (Civil) also for Marine Expert. Masters in Ocean Engineering or Marine Engineering will be added qualification with 10% - 20% weightage on marks.</p> <p>Qualification and Experience: BE / B.Tech. (Marine Engineering) or (Civil</p>	Clause remains unchanged.

			<p>Engineering) or (Ocean Engineering)</p> <p>(a) &gt;10 year and &lt;15 years = 5 Marks (b) &gt;15 years = 10 Marks</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	
4.	Para 3	<b>Terms of Reference (scope of work)</b>	<p>Based on our understanding of objective and scope, as per ToR. Scope of work has several components that are not elaborated. These are elaborated below under queries (5), (6) and (7) with reference to specific items. We believe this would lead to varied understanding of scope, methodology and level of efforts among consultants. As a result, there would be wide variation in the financials, which may not be beneficial for IPA / Ministry as a Client.</p> <p>Variable components e.g, Bathymetry Survey, Wave &amp; Current data collection, market demand study etc. that has not been defined in the scope are mentioned below. We request, if those could be defined in accordance with below mentioned questions. This will create a level-playing field among consultants.</p>	<p>Met Oceanic related data collection or review is not part of the scope of work. The consultant may assume that all Major Ports have the information regarding Met oceanic data for the purpose of commissioning/berthing o of FSRU.</p>
5.	Para 3 Point 3.2	<b>Terms of Reference (scope of work)</b>	<p>Potential FSRU suppliers / investors: (Being a critical source for validation, we understand adequate level of support would be provided by IPA/ Ministry, but their identification would be a critical part, that is not defined)</p> <p>(i) As there are more &amp; more investments pulled in from overseas, are we targeting those established in India or overseas too? (ii) Is there any cap on number of suppliers / investors or size? (iii) Further, are we expecting the consultant to plan a</p>	<p>At policy formulation stage no cap on prospective investors /suppliers is envisaged and no road shows are proposed.</p>

			<p>roadshow to identify suppliers/ investors, there could be several players which does not show-up their interest but are waiting for viable opportunities, to cross their table.</p> <p>Please Clarify and confirm.</p>	
6.	Para 3 Point 3.3	<b>Terms of Reference (scope of work)</b>	<p>Gas market demand assessment: (Being an essential component for this study, is not elaborated properly on its vectors)</p> <p>(i) To assess the viability of a project, it is necessary to understand market demand for a period of 25 years, that includes loan period of 15 years. What is your perspective?</p> <p>(ii) In the present scenario, where we are considering viability of 12 major ports. There could be several ways to carry-out demand assessment either only for areas near to ports or to consider demand on PAN-India basis, to understand the mix of domestic and imported gas. The present scope does not define it.</p> <p>(iii) Sensitivities would also be required to be build-in, to understand, whether the existing player be able to recover the off-take infrastructure cost. The present scope does not define it.</p> <p>(iv) Are we planning to carry-out a fresh independent study based on secondary sources or are we also trying to carry-out through a mix of primary as well as secondary assessment. This is also not defined.</p> <p>Please clarify and confirm.</p>	Market demand assessment may be indicated by the bidders based on the information available with them through published reports, information on internet, agencies under Ministry of P&NG and the conducted by the bidders themselves.
7.	Para 3 Point 3.6	<b>Terms of Reference (scope of work)</b>	<p>Benchmarking: (This being a fulcrum to fill the identified gaps, it is important to identify suitable</p>	The present proposal is with reference to attracting more investment in FSRU in

			<p>comparators through a correct framework)</p> <p>(i) It would be important to understand, whether the benchmarking would include suitable comparators / projects, based on similar geographical conditions, similar capacity handled, similar demand centres, or we are only trying to build a synergy from policies/ frameworks from developed nations including Europe, USA. Etc.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	Major Ports in India and to suggest corrections /improvements/modifications in the existing FSRU policy in India.
8.	Para 3 (Complete)	<b>Terms of Reference (scope of work)</b>	<p>A clarity on this account (refer queries 5, 6 &amp; 7 above), will help us to build our level of efforts and accordingly have a direct implication on the financial proposal. Moreover, there may be high chances that methodology may be good, but pricing may be high. So, if you can elaborate on the scope, it will provide a level-playing field for every bidder.</p>	Replies to queries at S.No.5,6&7 clarify the position.
9.	Para 12	<b>Deliverables</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We have noticed the time-frame is linked from award of letter of intent (LoI). As per our experience of working on similar engagements, contract agreement signed with a delay. Based on accepted accounting principles, most of the firms consider contract agreement as a valid contractual proof to kick-start the assignment. We therefore request you to kindly consider effective date of commencement as 'Date of Signing of Contract Agreement by both the parties', for purpose of contractual obligations etc.</li> <li>➤ Further, we would like to submit the proposed timeline of 8 weeks for a draft policy document, which would be formulated</li> </ul>	Bidders to follow the RFP/Bidding document.

after a lot of deliberations and validation with number of investors / suppliers, benchmarking of policies, and demand assessment. Moreover, there would be a lot of back and forth between the policy contours that we propose in a first place and perspectives of Ministry / stakeholders. Even if we deploy dedicated staff, the proposed timeline is way too short to achieve, where it is important to gather a lot of data from various fronts and also brainstorm on what would be communicated in a report, which itself eats a lot of time. We request you to kindly consider the submission on payment terms as follows;

<i>Sl. No</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>	<i>Timeframe from signing of contract agreement</i>
1.	<i>Preliminary Draft Report for setting up an onshore/ offshore LNG Import and Regasification Terminal</i>	<i>10 weeks</i>
2.	<i>Draft policy required for Major Ports</i>	<i>12 weeks</i>
3.	<i>Implementation framework/ guideline at port level, including obligation of ports and PPP</i>	<i>Within two weeks from receipt of go-ahead on contours of draft policy</i>
4.	<i>Changes required in Model Concession Agreement</i>	<i>Within two weeks from receipt of go-ahead on implementation framework / obligations</i>

			5. <i>Final Feasibility Study Report for setting up an onshore/ offshore LNG Import and Regasification Terminal</i>	<i>Within two weeks from receipt of final comments / suggestions</i>	
10.	Para 13	<b>Terms of Payment</b>	<p>We understand that the payment will be released within 30 days after submission of reports against the first two milestones.</p> <p>Further we request you to please split payment against the last deliverable milestone into two parts – 70% on submission and balance 30% on approval.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>		Clause remains unchanged.
11.	Para 1 Point 1.2 Sub point – (ii), (iii) & (iv)	<b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The schedule for receipt of application</li> </ul>	<p>It is requested to provide minimum 2 weeks for the proposal submission, from the date of issuance of reply of pre-bid clarifications.</p> <p>Further we request you to provide One day time for submission of hard copy of Technical proposal and original EMD instrument after online bid submission i.e. on next day by 15:00 hrs.</p>		Refer to Corrigendum –IV.
<b>M/s Lloyd</b>					
12.	Para 3	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE (SCOPE OF WORK)</b>	<p>The ToR is very brief, request you to please elaborate on the scope of work.</p> <p>Does the assessment include all major ports under IPA, request you to share the list of Ports to be assessed in detail?</p>		Scope of work is mentioned in the RFP document.
13.	Para 5 Table A (ii)	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</b></li> <li><b>A (ii) : Past experience and Capability</b></li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-Qualification allows projects executed during the last Ten years, however, the condition here is not the same for the evaluation criteria where it is 3 years, request you to please amend it to 10 years.</li> <li>Can we use more international assignments? Request you to relax the scoring criteria on Domestic credentials</li> </ol>		Clause remains unchanged. More than three years experience is not restricting the prospective bidders. Past three years experience may indicate the presence of the prospective bidders in the contemporary business.

14.	Para 5 Table B	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</b></li> </ul>	<p>We believe that a Marine/Ship/Port Management qualification also justify the requirement in addition to Civil Eng. with strong FSRU/LNG experience. Request you to Kindly allow the same.</p>	<p>The present proposal is specific to explore possibilities and prospects of commissioning of FSRU in Major Ports.</p>
15.	Para 5 Table C	<b>Proposal Format &amp; Technical Evaluation Criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Technical Evaluation Scoring Matrix</b></li> <li>• <b>Presentation to Selection Committee (SC) / Representatives of MoS/IPA</b></li> </ul>	<p>There are no marks for Approach and Methodology and clarity on the presentation marks. Will the presentation be planned post bid submission? Shall the presentation be submitted along with the tender documents?</p>	<p>Copy of presentation shall be submitted during the presentation for Technical Evaluation.</p>