



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

CRBC IRRIGATION DIVISION DIKHAN.

Phone & Fax No. 0966-9280237 Email: xencrbcirri@gmail.com.

No 1091 / (4-M)

Dated

DIKhan

the 25 /08/2025.

To,

The All Prospective Consultants.

SUBJECT: ADDENDUM NO.1

The following Addendum No.1 for the "ADP No.2056/240161 Feasibility Study and Detailed Design for Provision of Irrigation Scheme for the Left-Over Area of CRBC (LCG) i.e between Khaisor/Pezu Rang and Adjoining Areas District DIKhan" is hereby issued/notified to become part of RFP documents.

S.#	Reference from RFP	Relevant Projects
1	Relevant experience of the Firm	Relevant/Similar project includes; Feasibility Study, Detailed Design of Irrigation Canals with at least 2000 acres CCA, Lift Irrigation Schemes with at least 1500 acres CCA, Hydel Scheme, Hydraulic Structures, Irrigation Dams with Irrigation Network having 2000 acres CCA, Barrage, Head works.
2	Data Sheet 2.8, page 16	

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.

CRBC Irrigation Division DIKhan

Copy of the above is forwarded for information to the:-

1. Chief Engineer (South), Irrigation Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar.
2. P.S to Secretary to Govt: of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Irrigation Department Peshawar.
3. Superintending Engineer DIKhan Irrigation Circle DIKhan.
4. Procurement File.
5. Website of KPPRA & Irrigation Department.

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.

CRBC Irrigation Division DIKhan



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER

CRBC IRRIGATION DIVISION DIKHAN.

Phone & Fax No. 0966-9280237 Email: xencrbcirri@gmail.com.

No 1100 / (4-71)
To,

Dated

DIKhan

the 25/08/2025.

The Superintending Engineer,
DIKhan Irrigation Circle DIKhan.

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE PRE BID MEETING WITH PROSPECTIVE CONSULTANTS FOR ADP NO.2056/240161 FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DETAILED DESIGN FOR PROVISION OF IRRIGATION SCHEME FOR THE LEFT-OVER AREA OF CRBC (LCG) I.E BETWEEN KHAISOR/PEZU RANG AND ADJOINING AREAS DISTRICT DIKHAN.

Please find enclosed herewith Minutes of the Pre Bid meeting, held on 21/08/2025 in the office of the undersigned, for information and further necessary action please.

Encls:-

Minutes of the meeting

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
CRBC Irrigation Division DIKhan

Copy of the above is forwarded for information to the:-

1. Chief Engineer (South), Irrigation Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Peshawar.
2. P.S to Secretary to Govt: of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Irrigation Department Peshawar.
- ✓ 3. Consultant/Firm participated.

Encls:-

Minutes of the meeting

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER.
CRBC Irrigation Division DIKhan

Minutes of Pre Bid Meeting with prospective Consultants for ADP No 2056/240161 Feasibility Study and Detailed Design for provision of Irrigation Scheme for the left-over area of CRBC (LCG) i.e between Khaisor /Pezu rand and adjoining areas District DI Khan

A pre bid meeting for ADP No 2056/240161 Scheme was held with prospective consultants in the office of Executive Engineer CRBC Irrigation Division DI Khan on 21st August, 2025. Details are as under:

SNo	Reference from RFP	Comments of Consultants	Clarification of the Department
1.	General	Please clarify whether the proposals will be submitted on EPAD or in Hard Copy.	Proposals are to be submitted on EPAD as well in Hard Copies. In this regard necessary Corrigendum Notice has already been published in the press as well as uploaded on Department and KPPRA website. Date of submission of proposals has also been extended to 10/09/2025.
2.	RFP Data Sheet 2.8 (iii) page 16 and TOR Table 5-page 94	Please confirm that only 6 persons given in the Data sheet are the key staff and would be evaluated.	Though there are number of key staff which would be involved in the project, however for the evaluation purpose the 07 No key staff mentioned in the Data Sheet would only be considered & evaluated.
3.	RFP Data Sheet 2.8 (iii) page 16 and TOR Table 5-page 94	It is requested to replace Electrical Engineer in Key Staff with Hydrologist and keep Electrical Engineer in the non key staff.	The proposal is regretted.
4.	RFP Data Sheet 2.8 (iii) page 16	As all the position requirements are MSc. the higher qualification means Phd. For such project, experience is more important than the higher qualification as higher qualification is generally recommended for research type of projects. It is requested either to remove the criteria or to reduce the percentage to 5 to 10 % instead of 20%.	Criteria is in line with KPPRA. Hence no changes can be made. Proposal is therefore regretted.
5.	RFP TOR Table 4, page 93.	Comprehensive Model Study of the Canal Head Regulator & allied structures is a separate study and is possible only in Nandipur only. However, such study is required after the detail to confirm the parameters and minor changes, if required. The preparation and testing of the model generally take	Comprehensive Model Study of Canal Head Regulator & allied structures is part and parcel of the project which is pre requisite to ascertain the design parameters. Hence it cannot be excluded from the TORs. If needed the Competent Forum can always extend the project

		6 to 12 months which is not possible within the duration of 12 months of the project. We are suggesting to exclude this from the TOR and keep it separate after the design directly through Nandipur Institute.	duration during the currency of the project.
6.	FRP TOR Annexure-1, Reporting and Documentation, page 82	Time for feasibility study as well as detailed design is too short as it is huge area. In addition, the security situation may restrict the field activities time. It is requested to extend the duration to at least 18 months.	Financial phasing and time duration provided in the approved PC-II of the scheme cannot be altered. However, considering the justified reasons of delay in the project activities, Competent Forum can always extend the time duration of the feasibility study and detailed design.
7.	RFP Data Sheet 1.5, page -14.	Time for submission is too short as the area is quite vast and the consultants may require the site visit. In addition, the time is generally 14 days after issuing the minutes of the pre bid meeting. It is requested to extend time till September 16 th , 2025.	Agreed. In order to provide ample time to the consultants for assisting them with their visit to the project area and thereafter preparation of proposals, date of submission of the proposals has been extended to 10 th September, 2025. Necessary Corrigendum Notice has been published in the press and also uploaded on the Department & KPPRA website.
8.	Table 6 page No 96 of RFP G-Transport	We understand that that the vehicle mentioned under item 1 is to be purchased. Kindly clarify the brand /make and specs of the vehicle to be procured.	Yes, 01 No vehicle mentioned under Item 1 is to be purchased by the Consultants. Vehicle to be procured is 4 x 4 double Cabin, Toyota Rivo.
9.		Kindly guide where the project office and field offices are to be established under the assignment.	Project Office would be at DI Khan City while field offices would be established anywhere at appropriate locations in the project area.
10.	Qualifications and Experience of Key Experts.	The requirement of MSc with over 20-25 years of experience (with 15-20 years on similar assignments) is overly restrictive and may discourage participation. It is recommended to relax this requirement to MSc with 15 years of experience (10 years relevant) which aligns with KPPRA practices. Phd may be considered as an additional weightage but not mandatory.	The criterion is part of the approved PC-II of the scheme which cannot be changed at this stage. The proposal is therefore regretted.

11.	Extension of proposal submission deadline.	Considering the magnitude of the assignment, adequate time is needed for comprehensive proposal covering staffing, methodology, surveys and costing. We recommend extending the proposal submission deadline by at least 2 to 3 weeks.	Clarified at SNo. 7
12.	Relevant experience of the firm.	TORs should elaborate what qualifies as relevant experience.	It was an oversight not to mention Similar Projects in the RFP. Relevant /Similar projects include; Feasibility Study, Detailed Design of Irrigation Canals with at least 2000 acres, Lift Irrigation Schemes with at least 1500 acres CCA, Hydel Schemes, Hydraulic Structures, Irrigation Dams with Irrigation Network having 2000 acres CCA, Barrage, Headworks. Addendum No1 has also been issued.
13.	Vehicles & Logistics	TORs mention provision of vehicles & logistics but do not specify other specifications. This may cause ambiguity in costing. Minimum specs be provided.	Already clarified at SNo 8.
14.	Payment Terms	While the mode of payment is provided, the condition that payments are subject to availability of funds is highly uncertain for consultants. Since substantial upfront investment is required (survey instruments, environmental equipment, office setup etc). It is proposed; • Include 20% mobilization advance against bank guarantee. • Remove/revise the "availability of funds" clause by ensuring defined payment timelines. • Exclude retention money (not standard for consultancy contracts already secured by performance guarantees.	Payment schedule provided in the RFP is clear and elaborative which do not need any change. Funds for the project are expected to be made available by Finance Department as per financial phasing of the approved PC-II. Proposal of provision of 20% mobilization advance and exclusion of Retention Money from the running IPCs is regretted and not accepted.
15.	Reporting and Review Timelines	Milestones such as inception, Interim, draft, final reports are mentioned but client review timelines are not specified. This may delay approvals and payments.	Review timelines cannot be fixed; however, it is assured that every review report would be reviewed by the Client in the shortest possible time. There

		We propose fixing review periods of 15-20 days working days per report.	won't be any delays in the approvals and payments on account of report reviews.
16.	Hydrological & Geo technical data	TORs are unclear about whether the baseline hydrological data and previous investigations will be provided by the client. This should be clarified, as it directly affects the scope and costing.	As mentioned in the RFP all available data of the previous studies relevant to the instant project would be shared with the successful Consultants.
17.	Data Sheet 2.8, page 16	Which projects are to be considered as specific projects and how many maximum projects would be evaluated	It was an oversight not to mention Similar Projects in the RFP. Relevant /Similar projects include; Feasibility Study, Detailed Design of Irrigation Canals with at least 2000 acres, Lift Irrigation Schemes with at least 1500 acres CCA, Hydel Schemes, Hydraulic Structures, Irrigation Dams with Irrigation Network having 2000 acres CCA, Barrage, Headworks. Addendum No1 has also been issued. The firm having maximum similar projects will be awarded the maximum marks while for others rating would be reduced proportionately. The firm with the highest financial cost gets the maximum marks while other firms will get the proportionate marks.
18.	Key Professional staff page 16	Please clarify which key staff is to be considered for technical proposal so that CVs can be provided.	07 No Key Staff are mentioned in the Data Sheet. Details are as under: a) Project Manager b) Expert (Hydraulic Design) c) Expert (Structure Design) d) Expert (Geotechnical Engg:) e) Expert (Mechanical Engg:) f) Expert (Electrical Engg:) g) Expert (Environment)
19.	Data Sheet 2.8, page 16	Adequacy for the assignment: 36 Marks a) Relevant Experience = 27 Marks Maximum experience of 10 years = 18 Marks Experience of maximum of 10 projects = 9 Marks	Criteria is in line with the KPPRA practices and more importantly it is part of the approved PC-11 which cannot be altered at this stage.

		Some mega projects extend over 5 to 7 years with staff continuously engaged in the same assignment. For such staff meeting the requirement of 10 projects becomes highly challenging. We therefore request either the removal of this requirement or reduction in the number of the projects.	
20.	Terms of Reference Page 74-75	Is there any pre-feasibility study conducted specific to this project	As mentioned in the RFP all available data of the previous studies relevant to the instant project would be shared with the successful Consultants.
21.	Table 6	Kindly specify the model etc of vehicle to be purchased. Also increase rented vehicle to 12 minimum and R&M of vehicles to 24	01 No vehicle mentioned under Item 1 is to be purchased by the Consultants. Vehicle to be procured is 4 x 4 double Cabin, Toyota Rivo. Number of rented vehicles cannot be increased.
22.	Data Sheet	Kindly specify that the project is lump sum basis or time basis	Project is lump sum deliverable based. However, there are some components which would be paid as per actual measurement and work done.
23.	Table 6	As per our understanding the project area is much more volatile due to the security issues, it may or may not be completed in the stipulated time frame and for which EOT will be required.	Considering the justified reasons of delay in the project activities, Competent Forum can always extend the time duration of the feasibility study and detailed design as per Contract Agreement of the Consultancy Services.