INDIA SHIP TECHNOLOGY CENTRE (ISTC)

Response to Pre - Bid Queries
against RFP for
Hiring a Professional Agency for Conducting Skill Gap Study (2027-32) and Developing Skill Plan (2027-32) for the Indian Shipbuilding & Ship Repair Sector
Ref. No. : ISTC / TCB / TD / 01 / 2026-27

Date : 24.08.2026

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
1	General – Bid Security	Earnest Money Deposit and Performance Security	The RFP does not provide for any Earnest Money Deposit, bid security, performance guarantee or security deposit.	Request the Authority to please confirm that no Earnest Money Deposit or bid security is required at the proposal stage, and that no Performance Bank Guarantee, security deposit or retention will be required at the contract stage. If any such instrument is intended, request the Authority to specify the amount, format, validity and mode of submission prior to the proposal due date.	No Tender fee or EMD needs to be paid for participating in the Tender. The selected bidder is also exempted from providing secuirity deposit and Bank guarantee or Retention from payment against Invoices.	
2	General – Contract Documents	Draft contract and order of precedence	The RFP requires the successful Agency to sign the Contract within 7 working days of receipt of notification (Clause 6.7, Page 19), and refers to an agreed Service Level Agreement (Clause 6.10.2, Page 21). Neither document is annexed to the RFP.	Request the Authority to please issue the draft Contract and Service Level Agreement prior to the proposal due date, and to specify the order of precedence among the RFP, corrigenda, written responses to pre-bid queries, the Contract, the Service Level Agreement, the technical proposal and the financial proposal in the event of any inconsistency.	The Draft Contract / Service Level Agreement shall be provided to bidders. In the event of any inconsistency, the order of precedence shall be as follows (highest to lowest): 1. The signed Contract / Service Level Agreement 2. Corrigenda/Addenda issued by ISTC 3. Written responses to pre-bid queries issued by ISTC 4. The RFP document (including all Sections, Clauses, Forms, and Annexures) 5. The Agency's Technical Proposal, as accepted 6. The Agency's Financial Proposal, as accepted	
3	Form TECH-II, Page 22	Page limit for Form TECH-II	The list of Standard Forms records Form TECH-II – Agency's Experience as "Max. 30 pages".	Request the Authority to please confirm whether the 30-page limit applies to Forms TECH-IIA and TECH-IIB taken together, and whether supporting documents such as work orders, completion certificates, CA certificates, audited financial statements, incorporation documents, CVs and educational/experience certificates are excluded from this page limit. Request the Authority to also confirm the page limit, if any, applicable to Form TECH-III.	The 30-page limit is for Form Tech-II comprising of both Tech-II A & Tech-II B. The supporting documents are excluded from this limit. No page limit for Form Tech-III.	
4	Form TECH-II, Page 26	Permit CA/Statutory Auditor/MD certificate in lieu of work orders where NDA-restricted	Supporting Documents: Copies of work orders and completion certificates (or CA-certified fee receipt certificates for ongoing projects).	Consulting assignments are often governed by confidentiality obligations and Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs), which restrict sharing of work orders and completion certificates. In such cases, a certification from the Bidder's Statutory Auditor/Chartered Accountant/Managing Director is an accepted means of substantiating the experience across Govt. / PSU tenders. Hence, the Authority may consider permitting submission of a CA / Statutory Auditor / Managing Director's Certificate in lieu of work orders and completion certificates for completed assignments, wherever such documents cannot be shared due to confidentiality obligations. The Authority is requested to amend Form Tech-II as follows: "Supporting Documents: Copies of work orders and completion certificates / Certificate issued by Bidder's Statutory Auditor / Chartered Accountant / Managing Director certifying the details of the assignment, including client name, scope of work, completion status and contract value"	See Corrigendum Published.	
5	Annexure-1, Page 29	Extent of mandatory geographical coverage	Annexure-1 lists 13 key States/UTs including the Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep, with a note that the list is indicative and that actual coverage "shall be finalised in consultation with ISTC during the study inception phase".	Request the Authority to please confirm the minimum number of States/UTs and clusters that must be physically covered through primary fieldwork, and whether coverage of the Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep is mandatory or may be undertaken through virtual/telephonic consultation, as this materially affects field planning and cost estimation.	The list at Annexure - 1 is indicative. The Breakdown details, final list and mode of approach of sampling shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
6	Clause 3.4, Page 7 read with Clause 6.2.7, Page 15	Development versus recommendation of NOS and Qualification Files	Clause 3.4 states that a key objective of the initiative is "to develop National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF)". Clause 6.2.7 lists the deliverable as "Recommendations for creation/revision of National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF) for new/emerging job roles".	Request the Authority to please confirm that the scope of the present six-month assignment is limited to recommendations for the creation/revision of NOS and Qualification Files as stated in Clause 6.2.7, and that the drafting, industry validation, submission and obtaining of NCVET/Awarding Body approval for NOS and QFs does not form part of this assignment. If such drafting and approval support is intended to be included, request the Authority to specify the number of NOS/QFs to be developed.	Regarding National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF), the scope of work for the bidder is as per clause 6.2.7.	
7	Clause 3.4 – Key Objectives of ISTC, Page 7	Clarify whether full NOS/QF development (with NCVET submission) or only recommendations is expected	Objective includes "To develop National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF) aligned to industry needs and the NSQF."	Kindly clarify whether the selected agency is expected to develop complete NOS and Qualification Files for submission/approval under the NCVET framework, or whether the scope is limited to identification and recommendation of NOS/QFs requiring development/revision.	Regarding National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF), the scope of work for the bidder is as per clause 6.2.7.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
8	Clause 4.2, Page 8 read with Clause 6.2.8, Page 15	Functional specification of the IT-enabled mechanism	The Agency is required to create a model framework supported by an IT-enabled data collection and analysis mechanism/software/programme that requests and records employment data from pre-identified shipyards and stakeholders at predefined intervals, with self-analysis and automated report generation. No technical specification is provided.	Request the Authority to please provide a functional specification for the IT-enabled mechanism, including: (a) whether a survey and analysis application for the duration of the study is envisaged or a production system for recurring data capture beyond the assignment; (b) the expected number of user organisations and concurrent users; (c) hosting environment, cloud/data localisation, cybersecurity, authentication and MeitY/NIC compliance requirements; (d) integration requirements with any existing ISTC/MoPSW systems; (e) dashboard and reporting requirements; (f) User Acceptance Testing and go-live criteria; and (g) the scope and duration of post-implementation support and maintenance, if any.	The primary details of model framework supported by an IT-enabled data collection and analysis mechanism shall be provided by the bidder as part of Form Tech - III. The final mechanisam with all aspects shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
9	Clause 4.2 – Study Outputs & 6.2.8 – IT-Enabled Data Collection Framework, Page 8 & 15	Clarify expected complexity of IT-enabled mechanism (configured platform vs. bespoke build)	Requirement for a “model framework supported by an IT-enabled data collection and analysis mechanism/software/programme” and automated report generation.	Kindly clarify the expected nature and complexity of the IT-enabled mechanism/software/programme. Would a web-based data collection, database, dashboard and automated analytics/reporting solution configured using existing technology platforms meet the requirement, or is development of a bespoke standalone software/application envisaged?	The IT-enabled framework refers to a data collection and analysis mechanism. Its architecture, data fields, survey formats, and integration shall be finalised in the approved sampling plan, as part of the Inception Report. The same mechanism shall be tested, deployed, and made operational for actual field data collection, once the sampling plan and questionnaires approved by ISTC.	
10	Clauses 4.3 and 6.3, Pages 8 and 15-16	Sampling frame and facilitation of access	The study is to cover leading shipyards, ship repair facilities, OEMs, ancillary units, recyclers, maritime institutions and government agencies including MoPSW, MSDE, MoD (DDP), Ministry of Labour, DGS, IRS, NSDC, NCVET, DGT, AICTE, UGC and SSDMs.	Request the Authority to please confirm whether ISTC will provide the universe/database of establishments and institutions to be surveyed, and will issue letters of introduction and facilitate access and appointments with Central Ministries, State departments, regulatory bodies, public sector shipyards and maritime institutions. Request the Authority to also confirm that delays in stakeholder responses or access approvals shall not be attributable to the Agency for the purpose of timelines and penalties.	The bidder shall prepare a list of establishments and institutions to be surveyed. This shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan. ISTC will issue letters to the institutions or departments if required.	
11	Clause 4.3 – Major Stakeholders & 6.3 – Sampling, Page 8–9, 15–16	Request ISTC/MoPSW facilitation of introductory letters and stakeholder access	Study requires engagement with Ministries, Government Departments, shipyards, defence establishments, regulators, institutions and industry stakeholders.	Considering the nature and scale of stakeholder consultations, kindly confirm whether ISTC/MoPSW will provide introductory/authorisation letters and facilitate access/appointments with relevant Government Departments, public/private shipyards and other key stakeholders.	ISTC will issue letters to the institutions or departments if required.	
12	Clause 5 (Sr. No. 11), Page 10	Extend RFP submission deadline by 3 weeks from pre-bid response publication	Last Date for submission/receipt of RFP: 28.08.2026 before 04:00 PM IST	The Authority is requested to extend the deadline for submission of proposal by 3 weeks from the date of clarification issuance of pre-bid queries. This would give the Bidders sufficient time to prepare the proposal in line with clarifications issued by the Authority related to the pre-bid queries. The Authority may consider revising the clause as follows: “Last Date for submission/receipt of RFP: 3 weeks from publishing Pre-Bid Responses”	See Corrigendum Published.	
13	Clause 6 (Para 3), Page 11	Permit financial bid opening even with fewer than 3 bids	Please note that if ISTC receives fewer than three bids, ISTC may extend the bid submission date, decide to open the bid(s), or cancel the RFP, as per the decision of ISTC. ISTC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals without assigning any reason.	The assignment involves highly specialized strategic advisory services with stringent technical qualification criteria and significant financial eligibility requirements, which may naturally limit the number of eligible participants. Opening the financial bids only upon receipt of three or more bids may lead to unnecessary delays in procurement and commencement of this strategic assignment. Hence, the Authority may consider opening the financial bids even if fewer than three responsive bids are received. The Authority is requested to amend Clause 6 (Para 3) as follows: “In the event fewer than three bids are received, ISTC may, at its discretion, proceed with the opening and evaluation of the bids received, provided they are found to be substantially responsive, or take any other action deemed appropriate.”	Please Follow RFP	
14	Clause 6.1.2, Pages 11-12	Conflict of interest	The Agency is required to avoid conflicts with other assignments or its own corporate interests, and to disclose any situation of actual or potential conflict, failing which it may face disqualification, termination and/or blacklisting.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the provision of professional services by the Agency or its affiliates to shipyards, maritime institutions, industry bodies, other Ministries or other public or private sector entities shall not, by itself, be treated as a conflict of interest, provided appropriate disclosure is made and adequate confidentiality and independence safeguards are maintained.	This shall be finalised on a case to case basis under the discretion of ISTC.	
15	Clause 6.1.4, Page 12	Eligible entity types – LLP	Bidders must be a legal entity incorporated under Indian law, in existence for at least five years. The entity types listed as eligible are: Company (Private or Public), Registered Partnership Firm, and Registered Society/Trust. “LLP – Limited Liability Partnership” is separately defined at Sl. 07 of the Glossary (Page 5).	Request the Authority to please confirm that a Limited Liability Partnership incorporated in India under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008, which is in existence for more than five years and meets all other eligibility conditions, is eligible to participate and would be treated as covered under “Registered Partnership Firm”. Request the Authority to consider issuing a corrigendum expressly including LLPs in the list of eligible entity types.	See Corrigendum Published	
16	Clause 6.1.4, Page 12 read with Clause 6.3, Pages 15-16	Prohibition on sub-letting and engagement of field resources	“Sub-letting of the assignment in any form is strictly prohibited. The Bidder is solely responsible for end-to-end implementation of the scope of work.” The assignment requires a nationwide quantitative survey of an indicative 800 establishments, 300 personnel, 200 youth, 50 government departments and 80 institutions across all major shipbuilding clusters.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the restriction on sub-letting does not prevent the Agency from engaging field investigators, survey enumerators, translators, data entry and transcription personnel, cloud hosting and software development service providers, or specialist subject matter experts, in support of the assignment, provided that the Agency retains full and sole contractual responsibility to ISTC for the quality, confidentiality, supervision and delivery of all services and deliverables. In the alternative, should the Authority consider such engagement to fall within the scope of Clause 6.1.4, request the Authority to consider amending the clause so as to permit the Agency to engage a specialist field survey agency and technology service providers with the prior written approval of ISTC, with the Agency remaining solely responsible to ISTC for performance of the Contract. This clarification is material because the indicative quantitative sample of approximately 1,430 units is to be covered across the thirteen States and Union Territories listed in Annexure-1, including the Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep, within the milestone periods prescribed in Clause 6.4.	Sub-contracting shall be permitted only for specialized survey activities, and that too to reputed market research agencies. The overall responsibility for end-to-end implementation of the assignment, including surveys, shall lie with the bidder.	See Corrigendum Published

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
17	Clause 6.1.4, Page 12	Permit sub-contracting of specialized survey/fieldwork activities	Sub-letting of the assignment in any form is strictly prohibited. The Bidder is solely responsible for end-to-end implementation of the scope of work.	The scope of work requires conducting primary surveys for skill-gap assessment, which is generally undertaken through specialized market research agencies having established field networks and survey capabilities. Restricting sub-contracting for such specialized activities may impact the efficiency, quality and timely execution of the assignment, while the overall responsibility and accountability for successful delivery can continue to remain with the selected bidder. Hence, the Authority may consider permitting sub-contracting of specialized survey activities to reputed market research agencies while retaining the overall responsibility of the bidder for end-to-end implementation of the assignment. The Authority is requested to amend Clause 6.1.4 as follows: "Sub-contracting of specialized survey and data collection activities to reputed market research agencies shall be permitted, provided that the Bidder shall remain solely responsible and accountable for the end-to-end implementation and successful delivery of the assignment."	See Corrigendum Published.	
18	Clause 6.1.4 – Eligibility to Submit Proposal, Page 12	Confirm engagement of field enumerators/survey agencies/tech vendors does not constitute sub-letting	"Sub-letting of the assignment in any form is strictly prohibited."	Considering the scale and geographic spread of the primary survey, kindly clarify whether engagement of field investigators/enumerators, specialised survey support agencies, technology/service providers and individual subject-matter experts, under the direct supervision and contractual responsibility of the bidder, would be permissible and would not constitute sub-letting.	See Corrigendum Published	
19	Clauses 6.1.5, 6.8.1 and 6.10, Pages 12, 20 and 21	Limitation of liability	The RFP does not contain any provision limiting the Agency's liability, nor any exclusion of indirect or consequential losses.	Request the Authority to consider including a provision in the Contract to the effect that the aggregate liability of the Agency under or in connection with the Contract, whether in contract, tort or otherwise, shall not exceed the total fees paid or payable to the Agency under the Contract, and that in no event shall the Agency be liable for indirect, consequential, special, punitive or exemplary damages, loss of profit, loss of revenue, loss of data or loss of goodwill, save in cases of fraud or wilful misconduct.	This shall be included in the contract	
20	Clause 6.1.5(b), Page 12 read with Clause 6.8.1(c), Page 20	Arbitration versus finality of ISTC's decision	Clause 6.1.5(b) provides that disputes not resolved amicably within 30 days shall be referred to a mutually agreed independent sole arbitrator under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Clause 6.8.1(c) provides that the decision of ISTC on satisfactory performance "shall be final and binding".	Request the Authority to please confirm that all disputes under the Contract, including any dispute regarding satisfactory performance, acceptance of deliverables, levy of penalties or termination, shall be subject to the dispute resolution mechanism under Clause 6.1.5, and that the finality contemplated in Clause 6.8.1(c) shall not exclude the Agency's right to refer such disputes to arbitration.	Please follow RFP	
21	Clause 6.1.6(c), Page 13 read with Clause 6.8.1(g), Page 20	Force Majeure period – inconsistency	Clause 6.1.6(c) provides that if performance is prevented or delayed by Force Majeure for more than 30 days, either party may terminate the Contract without financial repercussion. Clause 6.8.1(g) provides that ISTC may terminate where Force Majeure prevents the Agency from performing a material portion of the services for a period exceeding 15 days.	Request the Authority to please reconcile the two provisions and confirm the applicable Force Majeure period after which the right of termination arises. Request the Authority to also confirm that in the event of termination on account of Force Majeure, the Agency shall be paid for all services performed up to the date of termination.	Force Majeure period shall be 30 days	
22	Clauses 6.2 and 6.2.5, Pages 13 and 14	Access to defence and naval establishments	The scope covers Naval/Defence vessels and defence shipyard operations, and requires inputs from the Ministry of Defence and coverage of defence shipyards.	Request the Authority to please clarify the process for obtaining security clearances and access permissions for defence and naval shipbuilding establishments, the extent to which classified or restricted manpower data will be made available, and the agency responsible for obtaining such clearances. Request the Authority to also clarify the treatment of any sub-sector where access or data is not granted.	ISTC will issue letters to the institutions or departments if required.	
23	Clause 6.2 – Scope of Work / 6.2.5 – Sub-sector Deep Dives, Page 13–14	Clarify defence-sector access permissions and confidentiality scope	Scope includes Naval/Defence Shipbuilding and inputs from Ministry of Defence and relevant shipyards.	Kindly clarify whether ISTC/MoPSW will facilitate necessary permissions for consultations with Ministry of Defence/defence shipyards and whether the study would be restricted to non-confidential workforce, employment and skill-related information.	ISTC will issue letters to the institutions or departments if required.	
24	Clause 6.2 – Scope of Work / Secondary Research Requirements, Page 13–15	Confirm whether ISTC/MoPSW will provide historical/administrative sector data or agency must source independently	Extensive sectoral, labour-market, investment, workforce, training and policy analysis is envisaged.	Kindly confirm whether ISTC/MoPSW will provide available historical/administrative data pertaining to shipyard capacity, employment/workforce, training infrastructure, skill initiatives, investment/project pipelines and previous studies, or whether the agency is expected to independently source all such information.	This will be in the scope of Agency. Please follow RFP.	
25	Section 6.2 – Scope of Work, Page 13	Extension of Skill Plan target year (2032 → 2037)	6.2.7 Skill Plan (2027-32) – Strategic Roadmap and Action Plans Suggested change: 6.2.7 Skill Plan (2027-37) – Strategic Roadmap and Action Plans	It is requested that a longer-term approach till 2037 may be considered, as most clusters are expected to operationalize post-2032.	Please follow RFP, also refer Section 4.2 regading extrapolation to 2047.	
26	Clause 6.2.6 – Human Resource and Skill Requirement Forecast, Page 14	Request ISTC/MoPSW-provided data for Conservative/Expansionary forecast scenarios	Forecast for 2027–32 under Conservative and Expansionary scenarios; organisation-specific data where available.	Kindly confirm whether ISTC/MoPSW will provide available project pipeline, investment, capacity expansion, policy and organisation-level workforce data required for developing the Conservative and Expansionary scenarios.	Data available with ISTC shall be provided. Other requisite details as relevant need to be collected and analysed by the Agency themselves.	
27	Clause 6.2.7 – Skill Plan, Page 14–15	Reconcile scope discrepancy between Clause 3.4 ("develop") and Clause 6.2.7 ("recommendations") for NOS/QF	Scope states "Recommendations for creation/revision of National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF) for new/emerging job roles."	There appears to be a difference between Section 3.4, which envisages development of NOS/QFs, and Section 6.2.7, which requires recommendations for creation/revision. Kindly clarify the exact scope. If actual development is required, kindly specify the indicative number of NOS/QFs to be developed.	Regarding National Occupational Standards (NOS) and Qualification Files (QF), the scope of work for the bidder is as per clause 6.2.7.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
28	Clauses 6.2.7 and 6.2.8, Page 15	Open-ended scope provisions	Clause 6.2 states that coverage "shall include but not be limited to" the listed sub-sectors. Clause 6.2.7 includes "Any other aspects incidental to this study" and Clause 6.2.8 includes "Any other IT-based requirements incidental to this study".	Request the Authority to please confirm that the scope of services shall be the scope set out in Section 6.2 as finalised and agreed in the approved Inception Report, and that any material addition to the scope, deliverables, sub-sectors, geographies, sample sizes, technology requirements or timelines thereafter shall be undertaken through a mutually agreed written change order providing for corresponding adjustment of effort, timeline and fees.	The open-ended scope provisions will be reviewed and finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
29	Clause 6.2.8, Page 15	Software licences, source code and handover	The framework is to be transformed into an IT-enabled mechanism with relevant software/programme support, with survey data captured and stored in standard formats such as SPSS/STATA or equivalent.	Request the Authority to please clarify: (a) whether ISTC will provide the hosting infrastructure and the required statistical software licences (SPSS/STATA or equivalent), or whether these are to be procured by the Agency and, if so, the number, type and tenure of licences required; (b) whether source code, documentation and administrative access are to be handed over to ISTC on completion; and (c) the party responsible for hosting, operation and maintenance of the mechanism after the six-month contract period.	All the expenses related to infrastructure, software, operational costs shall be borne by the bidder. The data and information gathered during the study needs to be handed over to ISTC.	
30	Clause 6.2.8 – IT-Enabled Data Collection Framework, Page 15	Request technology stack, hosting, cybersecurity, data localisation and integration specifications	Transformation of the framework into an IT-enabled mechanism with software/programme support.	Kindly specify whether ISTC has any prescribed technology stack, hosting/cloud environment, cybersecurity standards, data localisation requirements, user roles, APIs or integration requirements for the proposed mechanism.	This needs to be taken care by the Agency themselves.	
31	Clause 6.2.8 & 6.4 – IT Mechanism/Deliverables, Page 15–16	Clarify post-project IT hosting, licences, maintenance and support duration	IT-enabled mechanism is required as part of the study and is expected to be live during implementation.	Kindly clarify whether hosting, software licences, maintenance, technical support and post-project handholding for the IT-enabled mechanism are expected beyond the six-month assignment. If yes, kindly specify the required support period.	All data and information gathered during the study nees to be handed over to ISTC. Necessary Technical / IT Support shall be provided till the final handover of the same.	
32	Clause 6.3 – Sampling Information, Page 15–16	Confirm sample sizes are indicative/minimum, subject to refinement at inception	Indicative quantitative sample includes 800 establishments, 300 shipyard personnel/workmen, 200 youth, 50 Government Departments and 80 maritime educational institutions.	Kindly confirm whether the sample sizes indicated in the RFP are indicative/minimum requirements and whether the selected agency may refine/reallocate the sample across stakeholder categories based on statistical considerations and the sampling methodology approved during the inception phase.	The indicative sample size for the Quantitative Survey is a minimum mandatory requirement. Final quantity shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
33	Clause 6.3 – Sampling Information / Annexure-1, Page 15–16 / 29	Confirm whether coverage of all Annexure-1 States/UTs is mandatory or representative-sample based	Sampling shall cover all major shipbuilding and ship repair clusters across India, with special focus on key States listed in Annexure-1.	Kindly confirm whether coverage of all States/UTs listed in Annexure-1 is mandatory, or whether the agency may identify representative priority states/clusters based on concentration of shipbuilding/ship-repair activity and obtain ISTC approval during inception.	The list at Annexure - 1 is indicative. The Breakdown details, final list and mode of approach of sampling shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
34	Clause 6.3, Page 16	Indicative versus mandatory sample size	The table of sample sizes is introduced as "The indicative sample size for the Quantitative Survey is as follows", listing 800 establishments, 300 shipyard personnel and workmen, 200 youth, 50 government departments and 80 maritime educational institutions.	Request the Authority to please confirm whether the stated sample sizes represent a minimum mandatory achieved sample or an indicative sample to be finalised in the approved sampling plan at inception. Request the Authority to also confirm the treatment of non-response and refusals, and whether substitution of sample units from the same stratum is permitted so as to maintain statistical representativeness.	The indicative sample size for the Quantitative Survey is a minimum mandatory requirement. Final quantity shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
35	Clause 6.3, Page 16	Definition of a sample unit	The first category is "Shipyards, Ship Repair Facilities, OEMs, Recyclers & Ancillary Units – 800", comprising micro, small, medium and large enterprises.	Request the Authority to please clarify what constitutes one establishment/unit for the purpose of the count (for example, whether multiple yards, plants or units of the same group or company located at different sites are to be counted separately), and the minimum number of respondents to be covered per establishment.	The number 800 indicates 800 personnels from Shipyards, Ship Repair Facilities, OEMs, Recyclers & Ancillary Units. Breakdown details shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
36	Clause 6.3, Page 16	Government Departments sample	The sample table states "Government Departments – 50 (1-2 officials from each)".	Request the Authority to please clarify whether this denotes 50 government departments/organisations with 1–2 officials to be interviewed in each, or 50 officials in total across the listed departments.	The number 50 indicates 50 personnels from Government Departments. Breakdown details shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
37	Clause 6.3 – Sampling Information, Page 16	Clarify whether 800 = unique establishments or respondents/interviews	"Shipyards, Ship Repair Facilities, OEMs, Recyclers & Ancillary Units – 800"	Kindly clarify whether the sample of 800 refers to 800 unique establishments/organisations or 800 respondents/interviews, which may include multiple respondents from the same organisation.	The number 800 indicates 800 personnels from Shipyards, Ship Repair Facilities, OEMs, Recyclers & Ancillary Units. Breakdown details shall be finalized alongside the approval of the inception report and sampling plan.	
38	Clause 6.4, Page 16	Definition of project start date and deliverable sequencing	The deliverable schedule is expressed as T + 1 to T + 6 months, with "T = Project Start Date". The T + 4 Months milestone bundles the Industry Overview report, the Situational Analysis report, the ancillary sector study and deep-dive reports on all seven sub-sectors.	Request the Authority to please define the "Project Start Date" (i.e. date of issue of the Letter of Award, date of signing of the Contract, or date of the kick-off meeting). Request the Authority to also confirm that ISTC review and approval time for intermediate deliverables shall not be counted against the T + 6 month schedule, and that the schedule shall be extended by the period of any delay not attributable to the Agency.	The exact Project Start date shall be given during award of contract. Any unfortunate delays from ISTC side shall not be counted against the T + 6 month schedule.	
39	Clause 6.4, Page 16 read with Payment Milestone 2, Page 21	Timing of the IT-enabled mechanism	The T + 1 Month deliverable includes "Creation of a model framework supported by an IT-enabled data collection mechanism" and the approved inception report including sampling plan. Payment Milestone 2 requires "Approval of Sampling Plan; IT-enabled mechanism live and ready for use; Approved questionnaires".	Request the Authority to please clarify the distinction between the IT-enabled framework required at T + 1 Month and the IT-enabled mechanism required to be "live and ready for use" under Payment Milestone 2, and to specify the date by which the live system is to be delivered, since the sampling plan and questionnaires appear in both the T + 1 deliverable and Milestone 2.	The IT-enabled framework due at T+1 Month refers to the design and creation of the data collection and analysis mechanism. Means its architecture, data fields, survey formats, and integration with the approved sampling plan, as part of the Inception Report. Payment Milestone 2 refers to the same mechanism being tested, deployed, and made operational for actual field data collection, once the sampling plan and questionnaires stand approved by ISTC.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
40	Clause 6.4, Page 16 read with Payment Milestone 2 and Clause 6.10.7, Page 21	Feasibility of the T + 4 Month milestone	The T + 1 Month milestone covers the kick-off workshops, the IT-enabled framework and the approved inception report including the sampling plan. Payment Milestone 2 requires the IT-enabled mechanism to be live and ready for use and the questionnaires to be approved. The T + 4 Month milestone requires the Current Industry Overview and Labour Market Trends report, the Situational Analysis report, the study of ancillary sectors and deep-dive reports on all seven sub-sectors. The indicative quantitative sample is approximately 1,430 units across the States/UTs listed in Annexure-1. Clause 6.10.7 provides for a penalty of 5% per month on the contract value for delays attributable to the Agency.	Request the Authority to kindly note that primary data collection can commence only after the IT-enabled mechanism is live and the sampling plan and questionnaires have been approved, which leaves a field window of approximately ten weeks between the T + 1 and T + 4 milestones for completion of the nationwide primary survey and the preparation of four major reports. Request the Authority to consider either re-phasing the deliverables so that the situational analysis and the sub-sector deep dives fall due at T + 5 Months, or extending the overall assignment period to eight or nine months, so as to permit a statistically robust survey across all clusters. Request the Authority to further confirm that the time taken by ISTC for approval of the inception report, sampling plan, questionnaires and IT-enabled mechanism shall not be counted towards the intervening milestone periods for the purpose of Clause 6.10.7.	The IT-enabled mechanism shall be made live and ready for use within 2 weeks of approval of the Inception Report (i.e., by approximately T + 1.5 Months), so as to allow the primary survey to commence without delay ahead of the T + 4 Month reporting milestone.	
41	Clause 6.4 – Project Timelines & Deliverables, Page 16	Request extension of 6-month timeline for delays not attributable to the agency	Entire assignment is to be completed from T+1 month through T+6 months.	Considering the scale of primary research, stakeholder consultations, pan-India coverage and IT development, kindly confirm whether the six-month timeline may be appropriately extended for delays arising from stakeholder availability, Government/shipyard permissions, data availability or approvals not attributable to the selected agency.	It will be the reponisbility of the bidder to forecast any delays and inform ISTC in advance. ISTC may revise timelines under genuine circumstances.	
42	Clause 6.4 – Project Timelines & Deliverables, Page 16	Request a defined ISTC review/approval turnaround time (e.g. 7–10 working days) per deliverable	Multiple deliverables require approval/acceptance by ISTC at different stages.	Kindly specify the expected review and approval turnaround time from ISTC for each deliverable. We request consideration of a defined review period (e.g., 7–10 working days) so that subsequent milestones are not impacted by approval cycles.	ISTC shall provide in-principle approval to proceed to next stage after reviewing the deliverables at each stage, within 7 working days. Final approval shall be provided within 21 days subject to satisfactory completion of deliverables/ defect rectification.	
43	Clause 6.5.3, Page 17 read with Standard Forms list, Page 22	Prescribed checklist not provided	Clause 6.5.3 requires the technical proposal to include a "Signed copy of the checklist with seal". The list of Standard Forms at Page 22 comprises Forms GEN-I, GEN-II, GEN-III, TECH-I, TECH-II, TECH-III and FIN-I, and does not include a checklist.	Request the Authority to please provide the prescribed checklist format, or alternatively to confirm that a checklist prepared by the bidder listing the documents submitted, duly signed and sealed, shall be acceptable.	A checklist prepared by the bidder listing the Standard Forms at Page 22 and the supporting documents submitted, duly signed and sealed, shall be acceptable.	The forms submitted will be verified with this checklist as part of initial scrutiny of the Technical bid.
44	Schedule of RFP, Sl. 07, Page 10 read with Clause 6.6.1(d), Page 17	Password for the technical soft copy	The technical bid soft copy is to be password protected and emailed to ceo@istcindia.org before the closing time. The RFP does not specify when or how the password is to be communicated to ISTC.	Request the Authority to please specify the process and timeline for communication of the password for the password-protected technical soft copy (for example, whether it is to be shared in a sealed envelope with the hard copy submission, or emailed on the date of technical bid opening upon request), so as to avoid any inadvertent non-responsiveness.	See Corrigendum Published	
45	Form FIN-I, Page 28 read with Clause 6.6.1(d), Page 17	Mode of submission of the Financial Proposal	Form FIN-I states: "No scanned copy or digital version of the Financial Proposal is to be submitted or uploaded anywhere during the RFP process. Non-adherence shall lead to rejection of the Proposal." Clause 6.6.1(d) requires the technical bid soft copy to be emailed to ceo@istcindia.org.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the Financial Proposal is to be submitted only in hard copy in a separately sealed envelope at the ISTC office, and that no soft copy of the Financial Proposal is to be emailed. Request the Authority to also confirm that the technical soft copy emailed to ceo@istcindia.org must not contain the Financial Proposal in any form.	Password protected softcopy of the Technical bid only shall be emailed to the given ISTC email ID. Financial bid shall not be submitted via email. Hardcopy of the Technical and Financial bids, in separate envelopes shall be submitted to ISTC office in the given address.	
46	Glossary Sl. 05, Page 5 read with Clause 6.6.2(c), Page 18	Intellectual property rights	"IPR – Intellectual Property Rights" is defined in the Glossary. Clause 6.6.2(c) provides that all data and information gathered during the study are the exclusive property of ISTC. The RFP does not otherwise contain a substantive intellectual property clause.	Request the Authority to please confirm that ISTC shall own the final deliverables and the project-specific data collected for the assignment, while all pre-existing intellectual property, proprietary methodologies, tools, models, software, frameworks, templates, know-how and internal working papers of the Agency shall remain the property of the Agency. To the extent any such pre-existing material is embedded in the deliverables or the IT-enabled mechanism, request the Authority to confirm that ISTC shall receive a perpetual, non-exclusive, royalty-free licence to use the same for its internal purposes.	All the data and information gathered during the study are the exclusive property of ISTC.	
47	Clause 6.6.2 – Confidentiality / 4.2 & 6.2.8, Page 8, 15 & 18	Confirm pre-existing agency IP/tools/methodologies remain with the agency; only project-specific data/deliverables vest with ISTC	Data gathered during the study shall be property of ISTC; IT-enabled solution is also required.	Kindly clarify the ownership/licensing arrangement for any pre-existing proprietary tools, methodologies, algorithms, analytical models, software components or intellectual property of the selected agency used in executing the assignment. We request that pre-existing IP remain with the agency while project-specific data and deliverables vest with ISTC.	All data and information gathered during the study including the IT enabled mechanism developed for this study shall be the property of ISTC.	
48	Clause 6.6.2(c), Page 18	Confidentiality carve-outs	All data and information gathered during the study are the exclusive property of ISTC and shall not be disclosed or shared by the Agency.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the confidentiality obligation shall not restrict disclosures required by applicable law, regulators, courts or professional bodies, or disclosures to the Agency's legal advisors, auditors and internal quality reviewers under equivalent obligations of confidentiality, and that the Agency may retain one archival copy of its working papers for legal, regulatory and professional record-keeping purposes.	The confidentiality obligation shall not restrict disclosures required by applicable laws of the Union of India. Agency may retain one archival copy of its working papers relating to the assignment, solely for legal, regulatory, and professional record-keeping purposes, subject to the Agency continuing to maintain the confidentiality of such archival copy on the same terms as apply during the currency of the Contract.	
49	Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18	Definition of "Skill Gap Study"	Bidders must have conducted at least 3 Skill Gap Study projects in India or abroad in the last 5 financial years (FYs 2020-25), each with a minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs (exclusive of taxes).	Request the Authority to please clarify whether assignments involving manpower demand–supply assessment, labour market assessment, workforce planning, human resource and skill requirement forecasting, competency assessment, occupational mapping or sector skill strategy shall be treated as equivalent to a "Skill Gap Study" for the purpose of eligibility and technical scoring, where the assignment is not titled a "Skill Gap Study" but its scope substantially covers skill demand–supply gap assessment.	The Projects undertaken must be Skill Gap Study, for being considered for assessing experience. Experience in strategic assignments similar to the Skill Gap Study shall be considered, but only after verification of the scope of work and activities undertaken by the bidder in the implementation of such assignments.	See Corrigendum Published

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
50	Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18	Reckoning of financial years	Eligible experience is to be reckoned over "the last 5 financial years (FYs 2020-25)". The RFP is dated 28.07.2026, which falls in FY 2026-27.	Request the Authority to please confirm the exact financial years intended to be covered (i.e. FY 2020-21 to FY 2024-25), and to confirm whether qualifying assignments undertaken or completed during FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27 may also be considered for eligibility and for technical scoring under Criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.	See Corrigendum Published	
51	Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18 read with Criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, Page 19	Reckoning period for qualifying experience	Mandatory eligibility requires three Skill Gap Study projects, each of a minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs, in the last five financial years (FYs 2020-25). Technical Criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 likewise reckon qualifying experience only over FYs 2020-25.	Request the Authority to kindly consider extending the reckoning period for qualifying assignments, under both the mandatory eligibility criterion and Technical Criteria 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, to the last ten financial years (FY 2016-17 to FY 2025-26). It is respectfully submitted that the principal body of skill gap study work in India was commissioned during the period 2010 to 2017, including the sector-wise Human Resource and Skill Requirement studies and the district-wise skill gap studies undertaken for States and Union Territories under the aegis of the National Skill Development Corporation, and further that the window presently prescribed coincides substantially with the COVID-19 pandemic, during which the commissioning and field execution of primary-survey-based studies were materially curtailed. A five-year window may therefore exclude the most substantial and directly relevant national credentials in this field. It is also general practice in tenders for comparable studies commissioned by Central Ministries, State Skill Development Missions and sector skill bodies to reckon relevant experience over a longer horizon, so that established credentials in a specialised field are not excluded merely by the choice of window. An extended reckoning period would enable the Authority to receive a wider field of qualified proposals without any dilution of the standard of experience required.	See Corrigendum Published	
52	Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18 read with Form TECH-IIB, Page 26	Completed versus ongoing assignments	Eligibility requires submission of self-attested copies of relevant contracts/work orders and completion certificates. Form TECH-IIB permits, as supporting documents, "copies of work orders and completion certificates (or CA-certified fee receipt certificates for ongoing projects)".	Request the Authority to please confirm that ongoing assignments, where the prescribed minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs has been realised and evidenced by a Chartered Accountant certificate or client certificate, shall qualify both for mandatory eligibility and for technical scoring, in line with Form TECH-IIB. Request the Authority to confirm that a client certificate or work order read with a CA certificate may be accepted where a formal completion certificate is not issued by the client.	Ongoing/ Partially Completed Projects shall not be considered for assessing experience. Work orders and Completion Certificates from clients shall be accepted as supporting Documents for Experience. In cases where work orders and completion certificates cannot be submitted due to confidentiality obligations or Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs), a certificate issued by the Statutory Auditor/Chartered Accountant certifying the assignment details shall also be accepted, subject to verification at ISTC's discretion.	See Corrigendum Published
53	Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18	Basis of the Rs. 25 Lakh threshold	Each qualifying Skill Gap Study project must have a minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs (exclusive of taxes).	Request the Authority to please clarify whether the Rs. 25 Lakh threshold is to be reckoned on the total order value of the assignment (including multi-year or multi-phase orders and subsequent extensions under the same engagement), or only on fees realised within the specified five financial years.	The total cost of project, excluding taxes, over the completion period and over the different phases, if any shall be 25 lakhs. The evidence for the same shall be work order or Completion certificate.	
54	Clause 6.6.3(2), Page 18	Turnover and solvency evidence	Average annual turnover of more than Rs. 100 Crores for FYs 2022-25 with positive net worth in all three years; audited financial statements and a solvency certificate from a Nationalised/Scheduled Commercial Bank are required.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the turnover criterion is to be met by the bidding entity on a standalone basis, and to clarify the acceptable date of issue and validity period of the solvency certificate. Request the Authority to further clarify the acceptable evidence where audited financial statements for FY 2024-25 are yet to be adopted, and whether provisional statements certified by a Chartered Accountant may be submitted.	The turnover criteria shall be met by the bidder on a standalone basis. Only audited financial statements shall be accepted as proof of Turnover and provisional financial statements shall not be considered. The Solvency Certificate shall not be more than 30 days old as on the date of publication of the tender.	See Corrigendum Published
55	Clauses 6.6.3(3) and 6.6.3(4), Page 18	Meaning of "on roll" for Key Personnel	The Team Leader and the Maritime Expert are each required to be "at least one person on roll" with the prescribed qualifications and experience.	Request the Authority to please define "on roll" and to confirm that personnel engaged by the bidding entity as full-time employees, fixed-term employees, retainers or contractual subject matter experts, and personnel employed by the bidder's Indian network/affiliate entity, may be proposed against these positions, provided the bidding entity remains fully responsible for their deployment and performance. This clarification is sought as Evaluation Criterion 2.2 (Page 19) itself requires bidders to state whether proposed team members are "regular or contractual".	In Clause 6.6.3, Person on roll refers to an employee on pay-roll of the bidding institution as on closing date of bid submission. These 2 employees must be part of Team Composition in Evaluation Criterion 2.2.	
56	Clause 6.6.3(4), Page 18	Maritime Expert – qualifying experience	The Maritime Expert must have a minimum 5 years of experience in the shipbuilding, ship repair, or maritime sector.	Request the Authority to please clarify whether experience in ports, inland waterways, marine equipment manufacturing, ship recycling, maritime training/education institutions, classification societies, or maritime policy and regulatory bodies shall be counted towards the required five years of shipbuilding/ship repair/maritime sector experience.	The maritime expert should have relevant experience related to shipbuilding/ship repair.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
57	Clause 6.6.3, Page 18 read with Criterion 2.2, Page 19 and Form TECH-III, Page 27	Minimum team composition and level of effort	The RFP prescribes only two Key Personnel — a Team Leader (Clause 6.6.3(3)) and a Maritime Expert (Clause 6.6.3(4)). No minimum team size, no list of Key and Non-Key Experts, no minimum qualifications for other positions and no minimum level of effort in man-months is prescribed anywhere in the RFP. Form TECH-III requires the bidder to propose and justify the team structure, and Criterion 2.2 awards 10 marks for team composition.	Request the Authority to kindly prescribe an indicative minimum team composition and a minimum level of effort in man-months for the assignment, so that all bidders are evaluated and priced on a comparable basis. It is understood that, in addition to the Team Leader and the Maritime Expert, delivery of the scope set out in Section 6.2 would require, at a minimum: a labour economist or manpower demand–supply forecasting specialist for the two-scenario forecast under Clause 6.2.6; a sampling and survey statistician for the sampling design under Clause 6.3; a skills and qualifications expert conversant with the NSQF, National Occupational Standards and Qualification File framework; an information technology lead supported by software developers for the IT-enabled mechanism required under Clause 6.2.8; data analysts for processing of the primary survey data; regional field coordinators for the clusters listed in Annexure-1; and consultants for analysis and report preparation. Request the Authority to confirm whether such a team structure is envisaged, and to specify the positions for which curricula vitae are to be submitted and individually scored.	The Team composition shall be proposed by the bidders themselves. The team structure, personnels' qualification, expertise and methodology shall be proposed by the bidder and to be presented before ISTC. Awarding of marks will be based on the documents submitted and presentation also.	
58	Clause 6.6.3 (1), Page 18	Broaden eligible experience, extend reckoning period to 10 years, raise fee threshold to Rs. 1 Cr, allow CA/Auditor/MD certificate in lieu of work orders	Experience: Should have conducted at least 3 Skill Gap Study projects in India or abroad in the last 5 financial years (FYs 2020-25), each with a minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs (exclusive of taxes). Submit self-attested copies of relevant contracts/work orders and completion certificates.	The scope of work extends beyond Skill Gap Studies and includes institutional strengthening, capacity building, research and market assessment. Restricting the eligibility criteria only to Skill Gap Study projects may limit participation of qualified consulting firms having experience in similar strategic assignments. Further, restricting the project consideration period to the last five financial years may exclude relevant experience in comparable assignments. Additionally, consulting assignments are often governed by confidentiality obligations and Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs), which may restrict sharing of work orders and completion certificates. Hence, the Authority may consider broadening the eligible experience to include similar strategic consulting assignments, extending the project consideration period to the last ten financial years, increasing the Fee threshold to at least Rs. 1 Cr. to include relevant strategic assignment and permitting submission of a CA / Statutory Auditor / Managing Director's Certificate in lieu of work orders and completion certificates wherever such documents cannot be shared due to confidentiality obligations. The Authority is requested to amend this clause as follows: "The Bidder should have successfully completed at least three Skill Gap Study and/or similar strategic consulting assignments involving institutional strengthening, capacity building, research, market assessment or implementation support in India or abroad during the last ten financial years, each having a minimum contract value of Rs. 1 Crores (exclusive of taxes). The Bidder shall submit self-attested copies of work orders and completion certificates. In cases where such documents cannot be submitted due to confidentiality obligations or Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs), a certificate issued by the Statutory Auditor/Chartered Accountant/Managing Director certifying the assignment details shall also be accepted."	See Corrigendum Published.	
59	Clause 6.6.3 – Eligibility Criteria: Experience, Page 18	Broaden qualifying project types beyond assignments titled "Skill Gap Study"	At least 3 Skill Gap Study projects in the last 5 FYs, each having minimum contract value of ₹25 lakh.	Kindly confirm whether assignments involving labour market assessments, workforce studies, manpower demand-supply studies, sector studies, tracer studies, employment studies and skill ecosystem assessments would qualify where the scope substantially covers skill-demand/supply and skill-gap assessment.	See Corrigendum Published	
60	Clause 6.6.3 – Eligibility: Key Personnel, Page 18	Clarify whether contractual/retainer experts qualify as "on roll"	Team Leader and Maritime Expert are required to be "on roll".	Kindly clarify whether full-time professionals/subject matter experts engaged through contractual or retainer arrangements with the bidder may also be proposed, particularly for specialised maritime expertise.	In Clause 6.6.3, Person on roll refers to an employee on pay-roll of the bidding institution as on closing date of bid submission. These 2 employees must be part of Team Composition in Evaluation Criterion 2.2.	
61	Section 6.6.3 – Evaluation of Technical Proposal, Page 18	Acceptance of partially completed projects for eligibility	Submit self-attested copies of relevant contracts/work orders and completion certificates	Suggested change: Submit self-attested copies of relevant contracts/work orders and completion certificates. Partial completion of relevant projects shall be accepted provided the project was 70% completed both physically and financially, duly verified by statutory auditor/CA.	Ongoing/ Partially Completed Projects shall not be considered for assessing experience.	
62	Section 6.6.3 – Evaluation of Technical Proposal, Page 18	Maritime Expert → Shipbuilding & Ship Repair Expert – revised experience/qualification criteria	Key Personnel – Maritime Expert: At least one person on roll with a minimum 5 years of experience in the shipbuilding, ship repair, or maritime sector – Copies of Educational and Experience Certificates must be submitted.	Suggested change: Key Personnel – Shipbuilding & Ship Repair Expert: At least one person on roll with a minimum 10 years of experience in the shipbuilding and ship repair, with relevant degree (graduation/post-graduation) in shipbuilding related domain – Copies of Educational and Experience Certificates must be submitted. Remarks: The engagement is specifically focused on shipbuilding and ship repair sector. Therefore, it may be prudent to consider an expert with specific experience in the relevant sector. Additionally, given the width and depth of the study, more experience in the shipbuilding and ship repair sector may be required. Consequently, a shipbuilding or ship repair expert with minimum 10 years of experience with appropriate qualifications may be considered.	Please follow RFP	
63	Schedule of RFP, Sl. 13, Page 10 read with Clause 6.6.4, Page 19	Conduct of the technical presentation	Bidders qualifying eligibility and Part-1 of the technical evaluation are to make a presentation on 08.09.2026 for Part-2 (30 marks).	Request the Authority to please confirm the mode (physical or online), venue, duration, time slots and notice period for the presentation scheduled on 08.09.2026, whether the presentation content must be limited to Form TECH-III as submitted, the permitted number of representatives, and whether the proposed Team Leader and Maritime Expert are required to be present.	The time, mode (physical/online), venue (if required), duration, participants, etc. for the presentation shall be intimated separately after Part-1 evaluation of the technical bids. The presentation content shall be limited to that submitted via Form TECH-III.	The presentation must give a clear-cut picture of the methodology adopted by the agency conducting the Skill Gap Study.

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
64	Clause 6.6.4, Criterion 1.1, Page 19	Counting of eligibility projects under Criterion 1.1	Criterion 1.1 awards 20 marks for 3 Skill Gap Study projects and 2 marks for each additional project, subject to a maximum of 30 marks. Mandatory eligibility separately requires 3 such projects.	Request the Authority to please confirm that the same three projects submitted to meet mandatory eligibility shall be counted for the award of 20 marks under Criterion 1.1, and to clarify the maximum number of additional projects that may be submitted for the incremental 2 marks each.	At least 3 Skill Gap Study projects, each with a minimum contract value of Rs. 25 Lakhs, are a mandatory eligibility criterion. Only these 3 shall be considered for awarding 20 marks under Criterion 1.1. Bidders may submit up to 5 additional projects to accumulate the maximum of 30 marks under Criterion 1.1.	The Rs. 25 Lakh project value threshold is applicable only to the 3 mandatory projects for assessing eligibility. No minimum project value threshold applies to the other/additional projects.
65	Clause 6.6.4, Criteria 1.1 and 1.2, Page 19	Overlap between Criteria 1.1 and 1.2	Criterion 1.1 scores Skill Gap Study projects generally (30 marks). Criterion 1.2 scores experience in Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sector Skill Gap Studies (20 marks).	Request the Authority to please confirm that a Skill Gap Study assignment executed in the maritime, shipbuilding or port sector may be counted under both Criterion 1.1 and Criterion 1.2, or alternatively to clarify how such assignments are to be allocated between the two criteria.	The projects considered under Criterion 1.1 shall also be considered under Criterion 1.2 if the project falls within the Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sector. 10 marks are awarded for 1 such project, and Bidders may submit up to 5 additional projects to accumulate the maximum of 20 marks under Criterion 1.2.	
66	Clause 6.6.4, Criterion 1.2, Page 19	Scope of qualifying maritime experience	Criterion 1.2 awards up to 20 marks for "Experience in Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sector Skill Gap Studies" – 10 marks for one project and 2 marks for each additional project.	Request the Authority to please clarify whether assignments in the maritime, shipbuilding, ship repair, ports, inland waterways or logistics sectors covering workforce planning, manpower demand assessment, competency mapping, labour market assessment, training needs assessment or skill development strategy shall qualify under this criterion, or whether the assignment must specifically be titled a "Skill Gap Study".	See Corrigendum Published	
67	Clause 6.6.4, Criterion 1.2, Page 19 read with Clause 6.6.3(1), Page 18	Alternative means of satisfying the maritime sector criterion	Criterion 1.2 carries 20 marks and, as drafted, requires the convergence of three elements within a single assignment: that it be a Skill Gap Study; that it have been undertaken in the maritime, shipbuilding or port sector; and that it have been executed within FYs 2020-25.	Request the Authority to kindly consider amending Criterion 1.2 so that it may be satisfied either (a) by a Skill Gap Study undertaken in the maritime, shipbuilding, ship repair or port sector, as presently drafted; or (b) by a combination of (i) Skill Gap Study or workforce/manpower assessment experience in any sector, and (ii) separately evidenced advisory, research or consulting experience in the maritime, shipping, ports, inland waterways or shipbuilding sector. It is respectfully submitted that assignments converging all of the elements presently required within a single engagement are very few in the Indian market, and that the criterion as drafted may consequently narrow the field of responsive bidders. It is general practice in tenders for specialised sector studies to permit domain familiarity and study methodology to be evidenced through separate assignments, rather than to require a single engagement combining both, so as to attract a sufficient number of qualified proposals. The amendment proposed would preserve the Authority's requirement that the successful agency demonstrate both skill gap study methodology and maritime sector familiarity, while permitting those two capabilities to be evidenced through separate assignments.	Experience in strategic assignments similar to the Skill Gap Study shall be considered, but only after verification of the scope of work and activities undertaken by the bidder in the implementation of such assignments.	See Corrigendum Published
68	Clause 6.6.4, Criterion 1.3, Page 19	Geographical coverage – method of counting	Criterion 1.3 awards up to 10 marks for Indian States/UTs covered in Skill Gap Studies in the last 5 FYs – 5 marks for one State/UT and 1 mark for each additional State/UT.	Request the Authority to please clarify whether, in the case of a national or multi-State Skill Gap Study, each State/UT covered by that single assignment shall be counted separately towards this criterion. Request the Authority to also specify the documentary evidence required to establish State/UT coverage (for example, the work order, terms of reference, sampling plan or client certificate).	The projects considered under Criteria 1.1 and 1.2 shall also be considered under Criterion 1.3, if the scope of the project covers Indian States/UTs. For multi-state projects, each State/UT covered shall be counted separately for awarding marks. The evidence for evaluation shall be the work order submitted.	
69	Clause 6.6.4, Criterion 2.2, Page 19 read with Form TECH-III, Page 27	Team composition and CV requirements	Criterion 2.2 awards 10 marks for proposed team experience, involvement stage/period and engagement type. Form TECH-III requires a Staffing and Study Management Plan listing key staff and responsibilities.	Request the Authority to please specify the minimum team structure expected (positions, number of Key Experts and Non-Key Experts, and minimum qualifications/experience for each), the number of CVs to be submitted with the proposal, and the positions that will be individually scored. Request the Authority to also confirm the process and timelines for substitution of proposed personnel during the bid validity period and during contract execution.	The Team composition shall be proposed by the bidders themselves. The team structure, personnels' qualification, expertise and methodology shall be proposed by the bidder and to be presented before ISTC. Awarding of marks will be based on the documents submitted and presentation also.	
70	Clause 6.6.4 and Clause 6.7, Page 19	Method of selection — request for adoption of QCBS	Clause 6.6.4 prescribes a technical evaluation of 100 marks, with a minimum of 40 marks in Part-1 and 60 marks in aggregate. Clause 6.7 provides that "The contract will be awarded to the Bidder with the lowest Financial Bid (L1)". No weightage is assigned to the technical score in the final determination of the successful bidder.	Request the Authority to kindly consider adopting Quality and Cost Based Selection in place of the lowest-cost method for this assignment, with a technical weightage of 80% and a financial weightage of 20% — being the maximum technical weightage permissible under Rule 192(iv) of the General Financial Rules, 2017 — or alternatively 70:30, as illustrated in that Rule. It is respectfully submitted that Rule 193 of the General Financial Rules, 2017 envisages the Least Cost System for assignments "of a standard or routine nature … where well established methodologies, practices and standards exist", whereas the present assignment is a strategic national study involving two-scenario human resource demand and supply forecasting for 2027-32 with extrapolation to 2047, a nationwide primary survey across all sub-sectors, sub-sector deep dives, recommendations on National Occupational Standards and Qualification Files, and the design of a bespoke IT-enabled data collection and analysis mechanism, for which no standard or well-established methodology exists. A quality-weighted evaluation would also assist the Authority in attracting and securing the participation of established professional firms with specialist sectoral, research and technology capability, and in obtaining the benefit of superior research design and analytical rigour, which the present structure does not reward once the qualifying score of 60 marks has been attained. It is submitted that the technical scoring framework already prescribed under Clause 6.6.4 yields a technical score out of 100 and could be applied for this purpose without any change to the evaluation criteria.	See Corrigendum Published	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
71	Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.1), Page 19	Broaden Criterion 1.1 scope, allow parent/sister company experience, extend period to 10 years, raise fee threshold to Rs. 1 Cr	Experience of conducting Skill Gap Study Projects (last 5 FYs 2020-25). For 3 projects – 20 marks; Each additional project – 2 marks (Max 30 marks).	The scope of work under consideration extends beyond Skill Gap Studies and includes institutional strengthening, capacity building, research and market assessment. Restricting the experience criteria only to Skill Gap Studies may limit participation of qualified consulting firms. Further, as limited such assignments have been undertaken in India, the Authority may consider allowing the experience of the Bidder's parent / sister company in case of global consulting firms to reflect their overall institutional capability. Additionally, restricting the project consideration period to the last five financial years may further limit participation. Hence, the Authority may consider extending the experience period to the last ten financial years and increasing the Fee threshold to at least Rs. 1 Cr. to include relevant strategic assignment. The Authority is requested to amend Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.1) as follows: "Experience of conducting Skill Gap Studies and / or similar assignments involving institutional strengthening, capacity building, research, market assessment or implementation support during the last ten financial years (FY2016-26) each having a minimum contract value of Rs. 1 Crores (exclusive of taxes). The Bidder may submit the relevant project experience of the bidding entity as well as its parent and/or sister companies, including global experience, for the purpose of meeting this requirement. For 3 projects – 20 marks; Each additional project – 2 marks (Max 30 marks)"	See Corrigendum Published.	
72	Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.2), Page 19	Broaden Criterion 1.2 scope, allow parent/sister company experience, raise fee threshold to Rs. 1 Cr	Experience in Maritime / Shipbuilding / Port Sector Skill Gap Studies. For 1 project – 10 marks; Each additional project – 2 marks (Max 30 marks).	The scope of work under consideration extends beyond Skill Gap Studies and includes institutional strengthening, capacity building, research and market assessment. Restricting the experience criteria only to Skill Gap Studies may limit participation of qualified consulting firms. Further, as limited such assignments have been undertaken in India, the Authority may consider allowing the experience of the Bidder's parent / sister company in case of global consulting firms to reflect their overall institutional capability and increasing the Fee threshold to at least Rs. 1 Cr. to include relevant strategic assignment. The Authority is requested to amend Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.2) as follows: "Experience of conducting Skill Gap Studies and / or similar assignments involving institutional strengthening, capacity building, research, market assessment or implementation support in Maritime / Shipbuilding / Port sector each having a minimum contract value of Rs. 1 Crores (exclusive of taxes). The Bidder may submit the relevant project experience of the bidding entity as well as its parent and/or sister companies, including global experience, for the purpose of meeting this requirement. For 1 project – 10 marks; Each additional project – 2 marks (Max 30 marks)"	See Corrigendum Published.	
73	Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.3), Page 19	Broaden Criterion 1.3 scope, extend period to 10 years, count each State/UT under multi-state Central Govt. assignments separately	Relevant Geographical Coverage (Indian States / UTs covered in Skill Gap Studies, last 5 FYs). For 1 State / UT – 5 marks; Each additional project – 1 mark (Max 10 marks).	The scope of work under consideration extends beyond Skill Gap Studies and includes institutional strengthening, capacity building, research and market assessment. Restricting the experience criteria only to Skill Gap Studies may limit participation of qualified consulting firms. Additionally, restricting the project consideration period to the last five financial years may further limit participation. Hence, the Authority may consider extending the experience period to the last ten financial years and increasing the Fee threshold to at least Rs. 1 Cr. to include relevant strategic assignment. Further, several assignments undertaken for Central Government Ministries involve coverage across multiple States / UTs under a single project. Hence, the Authority may consider evaluating the geographical coverage based on the total number of States / UTs covered under such Central Government assignments instead of considering it as a single project. The Authority is requested to amend Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.3) as follows: "Experience of conducting Skill Gap Studies and/or similar assignments involving institutional strengthening, capacity building, research, market assessment or implementation support with relevant geographical coverage during the last ten financial years each having a minimum contract value of Rs. 1 Crores (exclusive of taxes). For assignments undertaken for Central Government Ministries/Departments covering multiple States/UTs, all such States/UTs covered under the assignment shall be considered for evaluation under this criterion. For 1 State / UT – 5 marks; Each additional project – 1 mark (Max 10 marks)"	For multi-state projects, each State/UT covered shall be counted separately for awarding marks. The evidence for evaluation shall be the work order submitted.	
74	Clause 6.6.4 (Sl. No. 1.4), Page 19	Rationalize turnover thresholds to widen participation	Financial Strength (Average turnover, FYs 2022-25): >Rs. 1000 Cr – 10 marks; >Rs. 500 Cr – 8 marks; >Rs. 100 Cr – 5 marks.	The financial eligibility criteria prescribed under Clause 6.6.4 are relatively stringent and may limit participation of otherwise qualified consulting firms possessing relevant technical expertise and experience. Considering the strategic nature of the assignment, technical capability should carry greater weight than financial size. Hence, the Authority may consider rationalizing the turnover thresholds to encourage wider participation while ensuring adequate financial capacity of the bidders. The Authority is requested to amend the clause as follows: "Financial Strength (Average Turnover, FYs 2022-25): > Rs. 400 Cr – 10 marks; > Rs. 300 Cr – 8 marks; > Rs. 100 Cr – 5 marks"	See Corrigendum Published.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
75	Clause 6.6.4 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, Criterion 1.4: Financial Strength, Page 19	Rationalise turnover-based scoring thresholds (suggest >Rs.300 Cr / >Rs.200 Cr / >Rs.100 Cr in place of >Rs.1,000 Cr / >Rs.500 Cr / >Rs.100 Cr)	Average Turnover (FY 2022–25): >₹1,000 Cr – 10 marks; >₹500 Cr – 8 marks; >₹100 Cr – 5 marks	The RFP already prescribes an average annual turnover of more than INR 100 crore as the mandatory eligibility requirement. However, under the technical evaluation, the maximum score for financial strength is available only to agencies having average turnover exceeding INR 1,000 crore. Considering the nature, scope and estimated level of effort of the assignment, this threshold may restrict competition. We kindly request ISTC to consider rationalising the turnover-based scoring criteria and reducing the threshold for maximum marks from >₹1,000 crore to a more proportionate range, such as INR 200–300 crore, with corresponding revision of the intermediate scoring slabs. This would enable wider participation of technically competent consulting/research organisations while continuing to ensure adequate financial capacity for undertaking the assignment. Suggested revision: >₹300 crore – 10 marks; >₹200 crore – 8 marks; >₹100 crore – 5 marks.	See Corrigendum Published	
76	Clause 6.6.4 – Technical Evaluation, Criterion 1.2, Page 19	Broaden Criterion 1.2 to allied sectors beyond maritime/shipbuilding/port	"Experience in Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sector Skill Gap Studies."	Considering the specialised nature of the requirement, kindly consider allowing relevant skill-gap/workforce assignments undertaken in the broader maritime, logistics, transportation, infrastructure, manufacturing, engineering and allied sectors for evaluation under this criterion.	Experience in Skill Gap Studies in sectors other than Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sectors is already considered under 1.1	Please Follow RFP
77	Clause 6.6.4 – Technical Evaluation, Criterion 2.2, Page 19	Confirm bidder may propose a multidisciplinary team beyond the two named Key Personnel	Team composition evaluated based on experience, involvement period and engagement type.	Apart from the Team Leader and Maritime Expert, kindly confirm that the bidder may propose an appropriate multidisciplinary team structure comprising labour-market/skill-development, research/statistics, maritime, IT/data and field-research experts based on its proposed methodology.	The Team composition shall be proposed by the bidders themselves. The team structure, personnels' qualification, expertise and methodology shall be proposed by the bidder and to be presented before ISTC. Awarding of marks will be based on the documents submitted and presentation also.	
78	Section 6.6.4 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, Page 19	Adoption of QCBS evaluation mechanism (70:30) with revised marking scheme	A two-stage technical evaluation will be adopted. Agencies scoring 40 or more marks in Part-1 will be invited to make a presentation for Part-2. Agencies scoring 60 or more marks in total (Part-1 + Part-2) shall be eligible for Financial Bid opening.	Suggested change: QCBS evaluation mechanism may be considered with 70% technical and 30% commercial split. Remarks: Considering the strategic importance of this project, it is requested that QCBS evaluation mechanism may be considered to ensure that selection takes place based on quality and merit.	See Corrigendum Published	
79	Clause 6.6.5, Page 19	Estimated cost of the assignment	A fixed single-point price is to be quoted for the complete scope of work, inclusive of all taxes, duties, levies, licence fees and out-of-pocket expenses including lodging, boarding and travel. The RFP does not indicate an estimated cost or budgetary provision for the assignment.	Request the Authority to please indicate the estimated cost or budgetary provision approved for the assignment, so that bidders may appropriately size the primary research effort, geographical coverage and technology component in line with the Authority's expectations.	See Corrigendum Published	
80	Clause 6.6.5, Page 19 read with Form FIN-I, Page 28	Basis of determination of L1	Clause 6.6.5 provides that the quoted price shall be inclusive of all taxes, duties, levies, licence fees and out-of-pocket expenses. Form FIN-I requires professional fees, GST and any other taxes to be shown separately, with a TOTAL inclusive of all taxes. Clause 6.7 provides that the contract will be awarded to the bidder with the lowest financial bid (L1).	Request the Authority to please confirm whether L1 will be determined on the TOTAL amount inclusive of GST and all other taxes, or on the professional fees exclusive of GST. Request the Authority to also confirm that any change in the rate of GST or the introduction of any new statutory levy after the bid due date shall be to the account of ISTC and payable at actuals.	The Method of selection shall be QCBS system. Lowest bid shall be awarded maximum of 100 marks and it shall be determined on the Total Amount inclusive of GST and all other taxes.	See Corrigendum Published
81	Clause 6.6.5 – Financial Bid Evaluation, Page 19	Adopt QCBS (80:20 technical:financial) in place of L1-among-qualified selection	Financial bids are opened for bidders scoring ≥60 marks in Technical Evaluation. Contract is thereafter awarded to the bidder with the Lowest Financial Bid (L1).	The proposed assignment entails a highly specialised and technically intensive scope, including pan-India primary research, sector/sub-sector deep dives, manpower demand-supply forecasting, development of a Skill Plan, assessment of emerging technologies and green skills, and development of an IT-enabled data collection and analysis mechanism. Considering that the quality of methodology, sector expertise, research design, analytical rigour and proposed team will have a significant bearing on the quality of outcomes, we kindly request ISTC to consider adopting a Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology with an 80:20 weightage for Technical and Financial scores, respectively, instead of selection purely on L1 among technically qualified bidders. An 80:20 QCBS approach would enable appropriate consideration of both technical quality and price competitiveness and facilitate selection of the agency offering the best overall value for this strategic assignment. Suggested revision: "The final combined score may be calculated based on 80% weightage to the Technical Score and 20% weightage to the Financial Score (QCBS 80:20), and the bidder achieving the highest combined score may be considered for award of the contract."	See Corrigendum Published	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks
82	Clause 6.6.5 – Financial Bid Evaluation, Page 19	Confirm all out-of-pocket expenses (travel, lodging, field survey costs) are included in the fixed price with no separate reimbursement	Quoted price includes out-of-pocket expenses such as lodging, boarding and travel.	Kindly confirm that travel, accommodation, local conveyance, field survey costs and other OPEs are to be fully included within the fixed-price financial proposal and that no separate reimbursement mechanism is envisaged.	All the expenses related to completing the assignment, including any operational costs shall be borne by the bidder.	
83	Clause 6.7, Page 19	Adopt QCBS (70:30 technical:financial) instead of lowest-bid (L1) selection	The contract will be awarded to the Bidder with the lowest Financial Bid (L1).	The assignment involves specialized strategic advisory services requiring extensive sector expertise, analytical capability, stakeholder consultations and development of long-term implementation strategies. Selection solely on the basis of the lowest financial bid may not ensure the best technical outcome for such an assignment. Hence, the Authority may consider adopting the Quality-cum-Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology to ensure selection of the bidder offering the best value in terms of technical competence and commercial competitiveness. The Authority is requested to amend the clause as follows: “The contract shall be awarded based on the Quality-cum-Cost Based Selection (QCBS) methodology with 70% weightage for the Technical Proposal and 30% weightage for the Financial Proposal.”	See Corrigendum Published.	
84	Clause 6.8.1(c) and 6.8.1(h), Page 20	Termination on subjective grounds	ISTC may terminate on 15 days’ notice if “the Agency fails to perform the tasks to ISTC’s satisfaction. The decision of ISTC shall be final and binding”, and on account of “any damage caused to the reputation of ISTC/MoPOSW due to mismanagement by the Agency”.	Request the Authority to consider amending the clause to provide that termination on these grounds shall follow a written notice specifying the material deficiency and a reasonable opportunity of 30 days to cure, and shall be based on objective acceptance criteria agreed at the inception stage. Request the Authority to also confirm that in the event of termination the Agency shall be paid for all services satisfactorily performed and all deliverables accepted up to the effective date of termination.	This shall be finalised on a case to case basis under the discretion of ISTC.	
85	Clause 6.9 – Payment Clauses, Page 20–21	Confirm milestone payments trigger on deliverable acceptance, and ISTC-caused delays don't attract penalty	Payments linked to satisfactory completion/approval of deliverables; payment within 45 days of invoice.	Kindly confirm that milestone payments will become due upon acceptance of the respective deliverables and that delays in review/approval attributable to ISTC or other stakeholders will correspondingly extend project timelines without imposition of penalties on the agency.	ISTC shall provide in-principle approval to proceed to next stage after reviewing the deliverables at each stage, within 7 working days. Final approval shall be provided within 21 days subject to satisfactory completion of deliverables/ defect rectification.	
86	Clause 6.9.2 and Clause 6.10.4, Pages 20 and 21	Payment for partially accepted deliverables	Clause 6.9.2 provides for payment based on satisfactory completion of deliverables. Clause 6.10.4 provides that partial or unsatisfactory deliverables shall not qualify for payment.	Request the Authority to please confirm that where a deliverable is accepted subject to comments, the Agency shall be entitled to raise the invoice for the corresponding milestone upon incorporation of such comments, and that payment shall not be withheld for the entire milestone on account of minor or non-material observations.	Payments shall be made based on completion of deliverables as per the milestones given. Partial or Unsatisfactory deliverables shall not be considered for payment	
87	Clause 6.9.3, Page 20 and Payment Milestone table, Page 21	Deliverable review and acceptance timelines	Payments are to be made within 45 days of submission of invoice, subject to successful verification and validation. All four payment milestones are conditional upon approval/acceptance by ISTC. No timeline is prescribed for ISTC to complete its review and communicate acceptance or comments.	Request the Authority to please prescribe a defined review period (for example, 15 working days from submission of each deliverable) within which ISTC shall communicate consolidated comments or acceptance, and to confirm that where no comments are received within such period the deliverable shall be deemed accepted for the purpose of raising the invoice. Request the Authority to also confirm that objective acceptance criteria for each deliverable will be agreed at the inception stage.	ISTC shall provide in-principle approval to proceed to next stage after reviewing the deliverables at each stage, within 7 working days. Final approval shall be provided within 21 days subject to satisfactory completion of deliverables/ defect rectification.	
88	Clause 6.10 – Reviews and Penalties, Page 21 onward	Request disclosure of SLA parameters, performance indicators, penalty triggers and penalty cap	Agency performance is proposed to be assessed against an agreed SLA on a monthly basis.	Kindly provide the proposed SLA parameters, performance indicators, penalty triggers and maximum/cumulative cap on penalties, to enable bidders to appropriately assess contractual and commercial exposure.	Draft Contract /Service Level Agreement, shall be provided to bidders. The aggregate of all penalties shall be capped at 10% of the total contract value	See Corrigendum Published
89	Clauses 6.10.4 and 6.10.5, Page 21	Undefined penalties and Service Level Agreement	Clause 6.10.2 provides that performance will be assessed against “the agreed Service Level Agreement (SLA)” on a monthly basis. Clauses 6.10.3, 6.10.4 and 6.10.5 provide for “appropriate penalties” and “penalties as imposed by ISTC” without specifying the trigger, quantum or method of computation. No SLA or draft contract is annexed to the RFP.	Request the Authority to please provide the draft Service Level Agreement and draft Contract along with a defined penalty matrix specifying the trigger event, quantum and method of computation for each category of default, prior to the proposal due date, so that bidders may accurately assess and price the associated obligations.	The Draft Contract/ Service Level agreement shall be provided to bidders.	
90	Clause 6.10.7 read with Clause 6.10.6, Page 21	Quantum and cap of delay penalty	“All delays attributable to the Agency shall attract a financial penalty of 5% per month on the contract value, read with the termination clauses.” Total penalties are capped at the total amount paid to the Agency under the Contract.	Request the Authority to consider amending the clause to provide that: (a) penalties shall apply only to delays solely and directly attributable to the Agency, after written notice and a reasonable cure period of 15 days; (b) the penalty shall be computed on the value of the delayed milestone rather than on the total contract value; (c) the penalty shall be levied on a pro-rata weekly basis; and (d) the aggregate of all penalties shall be capped at 10% of the total contract value. Request the Authority to also confirm that no penalty shall be levied more than once in respect of the same event of delay.	See Corrigendum Published	
91	Clause 6.10.8, Page 21	Delays not attributable to the Agency	“The Agency shall inform ISTC well in advance of any possible external delays. ISTC may revise timelines under genuine circumstances.”	Request the Authority to please confirm that delays attributable to ISTC, MoPSW, other Ministries, State Governments, regulatory bodies, shipyards, institutions or other third-party stakeholders, or arising from delays in approvals, access permissions, security clearances, data availability or Force Majeure, shall result in an automatic and corresponding extension of the project timeline and shall not attract any penalty.	It will be the reponsibility of the bidder to forecast any delays and inform ISTC in advance. ISTC may revise timelines under genuine circumstances.	

Sl. No.	RFP Clause / Page Reference	Subject	RFP Text	Clarification / Amendment Sought	ISTC Reply / Clarification	Remarks

92	Suggested Amendment to Technical Evaluation Criteria	Remarks
PART 1 – BIDDER AGENCY BACKGROUND		
1.1	Experience of undertaking projects in shipbuilding and ship repair domain with central/state governments/PSUs (excluding ports), completion in last five years (2020-25). For 3 projects - 15 marks, each additional project - 1 mark	See Corrigendum Published
1.2	Experience of conducting Skill Gap Study Projects (last 5 FYs 2020-25): For 3 projects – 15 marks; each additional project – 1 mark	
1.3	Experience in Maritime/Shipbuilding/Port Sector Skill Gap Studies: For 1 project – 5 marks; each additional – 1 mark	
1.4	Relevant Geographical Coverage (Indian States/UTs covered in Skill Gap Studies, last 5 FYs): For 1 state/UT – 5 marks; each additional – 1 mark; max 10 marks	
1.5	Financial Strength (Average turnover, FYs 2022-25): >Rs. 1000 Cr – 10 marks; >Rs. 500 Cr – 8 marks; >Rs. 100 Cr – 5 marks	