



CORRIGENDUM- 01

Date: 01-10-2026

Sub: Corrigendum to the Expression of Interest (EoI) for Appointment of Comprehensive Architectural Consultants for Master Planning, Architectural, Structural, MEP, HVAC, IT Services, Sports Facilities, Landscaping, Horticulture, and Allied Design Consultancy Services for Development of Permanent Campus of Indian Institute of Technology Goa.

Ref: EoI No. IITGoa/IWD/CDP/2026-27/14 dated 15.09.2026.

In continuation of the EoI cited above the Institute hereby issues the following amendments to the EoI document. The revised provisions shall be read in place of the corresponding existing provisions. Changes are shown in bold in the “Revised Provision” column, wherever the existing provision has been amended in part.

PART A — INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS AND APPENDIX (SECTIONS II AND III)

1. Registrations — Cl. 3.1 (Eligibility Criteria), Page 10 and corresponding Form, Page 40

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“Valid GSTIN, PAN, EPF, ESI, Labour registrations, and CoA registration (or equivalent).”	“Valid GSTIN, PAN and CoA registration (or equivalent). EPF, ESI and Labour registrations are not mandatory requirements for evaluation. ”

2. Sub-consultants — Cl. 3.2, Page 10, and Section III (Nature of Specialized Consultants eligible as sub-consultants), Page 18

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“Sub-consultants are permitted only for specialized services (MEP, Quantity Surveying, IT Networking, HVAC, SCADA, BIM, GRIHA, Sports, Lab Infrastructure, Horticulture and Interior Design). The lead consultant remains solely responsible.”	“Sub-consultants are permitted only for specialized services (MEP, Quantity Surveying, IT Networking, HVAC, SCADA, BIM, GRIHA, Sports, Lab Infrastructure, Horticulture, Interior Design and Structural Design). The lead consultant remains solely responsible.”

3. Bid Security / EMD — physical instrument (Section II, Cl. 1.4(4), Page 13; Section III: Appendix, Cl. 7.0, Page 20)

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Section II, Cl. 1.4(4), Page 13:	Section II, Cl. 1.4(4), Page 13:

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“In the case the bidder desires to submit Bank Guarantee ... or Demand Draft or any other accepted instrument instead of online remittance of the EMD, the original should be posted/couriered/given in person to the concerned official, latest by the last date and time of bid submission ...”	“In the case the bidder desires to submit Bank Guarantee ... or Demand Draft or any other accepted instrument instead of online remittance of the EMD, the original should be posted/couriered/given in person to the concerned official, within 7 (Seven) days from the last date and time of bid submission ... ”
Section III: Appendix, Cl. 7.0, Item 1, Page 20: “Bid Security amounting to Rs 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) shall be submitted by the bidders at the time of submission of EoI ...”	Section III: Appendix, Cl. 7.0, Item 1, Page 20: “Bid Security amounting to Rs 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) shall be submitted by the bidders at the time of submission of EoI ... Where the Bid Security is furnished as a physical instrument, the original shall be submitted within 7 (Seven) days from the EoI submission closing date and time. ”

4. Critical Dates — Section III: Appendix, Cl. 2.0, Page 18

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Document Download End Date & Time: 05-10-2026; 03:00 PM. EoI Submission Start Date & Time: 16-09-2026; 11:00 AM. EoI Submission Closing Date & Time: 06-10-2026; 03:00 PM. EoI Opening Date & Time: 07-10-2026; 03:30 PM.	Document Download End Date & Time: 20-10-2026; 03:00 PM. EoI Submission Start Date & Time: 16-09-2026; 11:00 AM (unchanged). EoI Submission Closing Date & Time: 21-10-2026; 03:00 PM. EoI Opening Date & Time: 22-10-2026; 03:30 PM.

PART B — QUALIFICATION CRITERIA (SECTION IV)

5. Criteria 1: General and Similar Experience — CoA-registered Architect, Page 23

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“Consultants must have at least 20 (Twenty) years’ experience in Consultancy Services. The Firm’s Owner or One of the Partners or Director or MD must be an Architect registered with Council of Architecture (CoA) and the firm must be eligible to practice Architecture as per CoA Act.”	“Consultants must have at least 20 (Twenty) years’ experience in Consultancy Services. The Firm’s Owner or One of the Partners or Director or MD must be an Architect registered with Council of Architecture (CoA) and the firm must be eligible to practice Architecture as per CoA Act. Consultancy firms whose Owner/Partner/Director/MD is not a CoA-registered Architect shall also be eligible, provided the firm has qualified CoA-registered Architects on its payroll and substantiates 20 (Twenty) years of Architectural Consultancy practice. ”

6. Criteria 1: Completed works — Period, Stage of Completion and Location of Projects, Pages 23–24

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“The applicant should provide documentary evidence for having satisfactorily provided comprehensive architectural & engineering consultancy services in their own name (not as consortium or joint venture) for completed following similar works during the last 09 years: The bidder should have, during the last 9 (nine) years [7-year qualifying period, extended by 2 year on account of COVID-19 pandemic-related disruption to construction activity during 2020-2022] (F.Y. 2017-18 to 2025-26), completed one or more consultancy assignment(s) of similar works ...”	Existing provision retained, with the following added: (i) The period of 9 (nine) years (F.Y. 2017-18 to 2025-26) applies to the date of completion of the work and not to its date of commencement. Projects commenced at any time, but completed within this period, shall qualify. (ii) A project shall be treated as “completed” if all scoped consultancy services have been fully completed and the project has achieved not less than 90% physical progress, as certified by the Client. This provision shall not apply to Criterion 1.4 (GRIHA Experience), for which only final certificates of completed works shall be considered. (iii) Only projects executed in India shall be considered.

7. Criteria 1(B): Experience in Comprehensive Architectural Services, Page 24

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“(B) Experience in Comprehensive architectural services: (a) One project of built-up area 2,29,000 sq.m or more; OR (b) Two projects, each of built-up area 1,71,500 sq.m or more; OR (c) Three projects, each of built-up area 1,14,300 sq.m or more.”	“(B) Experience in Comprehensive architectural services: (a) One project of built-up area 1,71,500 sq.m or more; OR (b) Two projects, each of built-up area 1,14,300 sq.m or more.” Sub-clause (c) is deleted.

PART C — MARKING MATRIX (SECTION IV)

8. Criterion 1.2 — Similar Masterplanning Experience: Scoring Formula under 1.2B, Page 25

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Criterion 1.2 — Similar Masterplanning Experience — Max Score 12.0 Ref: 1.2A Description: One project of Master Planning (as defined under “Similar Work”) for an educational campus ≥ 100 acres (eligibility floor for this sub-criterion) Marks: 5.0 Ref: 1.2B	Criterion 1.2 — Similar Masterplanning Experience — Max Score 12.0 Ref: 1.2A Description: One project of Master Planning (as defined under “Similar Work”) for an educational campus ≥ 100 acres (eligibility floor for this sub-criterion) Marks: 5.0 Ref: 1.2B (revised)

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Description: Marks = 1.5 for every additional 100 acre Master Plan works, capped at 7.0 Marks: up to 7.0	Description: Additional marks are computed on the incremental Master Plan area of the bidder's single largest qualifying project, beyond the 100-acre eligibility floor at 1.2A, at the rate of 1.5 marks per additional 100 acres, computed on a pro-rata basis for part-increments, subject to the overall cap of 7.0. It is not necessary that the additional area be demonstrated through a separate 100-acre-or-more project; a single Master Plan project substantially exceeding 100 acres is eligible for incremental credit computed this way. Where a bidder has more than one qualifying project, only the largest such project shall be considered for computing marks under this sub-criterion; the incremental area of multiple projects shall not be aggregated. Marks: up to 7.0 (pro-rata; Marks = $1.5 \times [(Area \text{ of largest qualifying project} - 100) \div 100]$, capped at 7.0) <i>Illustration (total marks under Criterion 1.2 = 1.2A + 1.2B): (a) A single 700-acre Master Plan project earns 5.0 under 1.2A and $1.5 \times [(700 - 100) \div 100] = 9.0$ under 1.2B, capped at 7.0; total 12.0. (b) A single 250-acre project earns 5.0 under 1.2A and $1.5 \times [(250 - 100) \div 100] = 2.25$ under 1.2B; total 7.25. (c) A bidder with two projects of 150 acres and 300 acres earns 5.0 under 1.2A and, under 1.2B, marks based on the 300-acre project alone, $1.5 \times [(300 - 100) \div 100] = 3.0$; total 8.0. The 150-acre project's excess is not added.</i>

9. Criterion 1.3 — Similar Past Experience: Comprehensive Architectural Services, Page 25

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
"1.3A: One similar project of built-up area $\geq 2,29,000$ sqm; OR two similar projects each $\geq 1,71,500$ sqm; OR three similar projects each $\geq 1,14,300$ sqm — 5.0 marks. 1.3B: For double the built-up area in any category at 1.3A — 4.0 marks. 1.3C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.3A — 3.0 marks."	"1.3A: One similar project of built-up area $\geq$ 1,71,500 sqm; OR two similar projects each $\geq$ 1,14,300 sqm — 5.0 marks. 1.3B: For double the built-up area in any category at 1.3A — 4.0 marks. (Double area: $\geq 3,43,000$ sqm for one project; $\geq 2,28,600$ sqm each for two projects.) 1.3C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.3A — 3.0 marks."

10. Criteria 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7 — Project typology, Pages 25–26

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
1.4 Similar GRIHA Experience — Max Score 6.0 1.5 Similar BIM Experience — Max Score 6.0 1.7 Similar External Development & Landscape Experience — Max Score 7.0	1.4 GRIHA Experience — Max Score 6.0 1.5 BIM Experience — Max Score 6.0 1.7 External Development & Landscape Experience — Max Score 7.0

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
	For the purposes of Criteria 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7, experience from projects of any typology (e.g., institutional, judicial, commercial, assembly buildings, airports, etc.) shall be considered; the project need not be a “Similar Work” as defined in Section IV. All other conditions of the respective criteria (area, rating, LOD, components, campus size and evidentiary requirements) remain unchanged, except as amended below.

11. Criterion 1.4 — GRIHA Experience, Page 25

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“1.4A: Cumulative GRIHA-rated built-up area (GRIHA LD for one development, or aggregated across individually-rated buildings, each 3-star and above) ≥ 2,29,000 sqm in one project; OR ≥ 1,71,500 sqm each across two projects; OR ≥ 1,14,300 sqm each across three projects — 2.5 marks. 1.4B: For double the cumulative GRIHA-rated area in any category at 1.4A — 2.0 marks. 1.4C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.4A — 1.5 marks. Evidentiary requirement: for a GRIHA LD rating, the GRIHA Council certificate stating the certified rated area. For aggregated building-wise ratings, individual GRIHA Council certificates for each building, each stating its certified rated area, summed to arrive at the cumulative figure. In both cases, the certified area — not the host project’s total area — is what is checked against the thresholds above.”	“1.4A: Cumulative GRIHA-rated built-up area: (i) GRIHA LD rating for a campus of more than 100 acres, as a single project; OR (ii) aggregated across individually-rated buildings, each 3-star and above: ≥ 45,000 sqm in one project; OR ≥ 30,000 sqm each across two projects. — 2.5 marks. Note: Equivalent rating systems of LEED/IGBC will be considered. 1.4B: For double the cumulative GRIHA-rated area in any category at 1.4A — 2.0 marks.. (Double area: ≥ 90,000 sqm for one project; ≥ 60,000 sqm each for two projects.) 1.4C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.4A — 1.5 marks. Evidentiary requirement: for a GRIHA LD rating, the GRIHA Council certificate stating the certified rated area. For aggregated building-wise ratings, individual GRIHA Council certificates for each building, each stating its certified rated area, summed to arrive at the cumulative figure. In both cases, the certified area — not the host project’s total area — is what is checked against the thresholds above. Only final certificates of completed works shall be considered for evaluation.”

12. Criterion 1.5A — BIM Experience, Page 26

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“1.5A: One project with BIM-modelled built-up area ≥ 60,000 sqm; OR two projects ≥ 45,000 sqm each; OR three projects ≥ 30,000 sqm each — in each case, coordinated Architectural + Structural + MEP modelling delivered to LOD 300 or above — 2.5 marks. 1.5B: For double the BIM-modelled area in any category at 1.5A — 2.0 marks.	“1.5A: One project with BIM-modelled built-up area ≥ 45,000 sqm; OR two projects ≥ 30,000 sqm each — in each case, coordinated Architectural + Structural + MEP modelling delivered to LOD 300 or above — 2.5 marks. 1.5B: For double the BIM-modelled area in any category at 1.5A — 2.0 marks. (Double area: ≥

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
1.5C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.5A — 1.5 marks.”	90,000 sqm for one project; ≥ 60,000 sqm each for two projects.) 1.5C: For more than the specified number of projects in category at 1.5A — 1.5 marks.”

13. Criterion 1.5 — BIM Experience: Evidentiary requirement, Page 26

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Evidentiary requirement: A certificate from the client (Officer not below EE/GM/Owner) explicitly stating (i) the total built-up area of the host project, (ii) the built-up area delivered through coordinated multidisciplinary BIM at the stated LOD, and (iii) the disciplines coordinated. A generic project completion certificate silent on (ii) and (iii) is not acceptable evidence for this criterion.	Evidentiary requirement (revised): Where the Client Certificate does not state the BIM-modelled area, LOD, or disciplines coordinated, the bidder may, in lieu, submit: (a) RFP/Work Order/BOQ extracts specifying the BIM scope and LOD requirement (certified copies); and/or (b) BIM execution records — model sheets/views, LOD matrix, and clash/coordination reports — bearing bidder’s professional seal, reg. no. and signature, showing the modelled area, LOD achieved and disciplines coordinated. Documents submitted under (b) shall be accompanied by, and read together with, a client-issued document under (a) (or the Completion Certificate / Client’s certificate of progress, as applicable) sufficient to establish that they pertain to the named project and client. In each case, the bidder’s authorised signatory shall submit a signed statement cross-referencing the claimed area, LOD and disciplines to the specific document/sheet evidencing it. Records bearing no professional seal, or unaccompanied by corroborating client-issued documentation, shall not be accepted as evidence. Authority may verify with client directly. False/unsubstantiated claims render the EoI non-responsive, besides other consequences under the Integrity Pact. For ongoing projects, the Client’s certificate shall state that all scoped consultancy services, including LOD 300 multi-disciplinary BIM modelling, have been completed and that physical progress is not less than 90%. Records submitted under (b) may be used only to evidence the BIM-modelled area, LOD and disciplines coordinated; completion of services and physical progress shall in every case be certified by the Client.

14. Criterion 1.7B — Wording, Page 26

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“1.7B: For comprehensive coverage ≥10 of the 15 listed components on the same campus at 1.7A — 1.5 marks.”	“1.7B: For External Development ≥10 of the 15 listed components on the same campus at 1.7A — 1.5 marks.”

15. Criterion 1.7 — External Development & Landscape Experience: Evidentiary requirement, Pages 26–27

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Evidentiary requirement: The client completion certificate must itemise which of the 15 components were actually delivered on that campus — a generic “external development and landscaping” line item, without a component breakdown, is not acceptable evidence for the ≥ 7-component threshold at 1.7A or the comprehensive-coverage requirement at 1.7B–1.7D.	Evidentiary requirement (revised): Where the Client Completion Certificate does not itemise the components delivered, the bidder may, in addition to such brief client certificate, submit: (a) RFP/Work Order/BOQ extracts (certified copies); and/or (b) GFC/as-built drawings bearing bidder’s professional seal, reg. no. and signature, showing the claimed components, with area statement. Drawings submitted under (b) shall be accompanied by, and read together with, a client-issued document under (a) (or the Completion Certificate / Client’s certificate of progress, as applicable) sufficient to establish that the drawings pertain to the named project and client. In each case, the bidder’s authorised signatory shall submit a signed statement cross-referencing each claimed component to the specific document or drawing sheet evidencing it. Unsealed drawings, or those without corroborating client documentation, are not acceptable. Authority may verify with client directly. False/unsubstantiated claims render the EoI non-responsive, besides other consequences under the Integrity Pact. For ongoing projects, the Client’s certificate shall state that all scoped consultancy services have been completed and that physical progress is not less than 90%.

16. Criterion 1.8 — Lab Experience, Page 27

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
1.8 Lab Experience — Max Score 8.0 Ref: 1.8A Description: One similar project having laboratory complex > 8,000 sqm built-up area Marks: 3.0	1.8 Lab Experience — Max Score 8.0 Ref: 1.8A Description: One similar project having a laboratory complex > 8,000 sqm built-up area, executed by the bidder directly or through a sub-consultant engaged by the bidder. Medical research facilities (laboratories and

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Ref: 1.8B Description: For double the area (> 16,000 sqm) in any single project at 1.8A Marks: 2.5 Ref: 1.8C Description: For two or more such projects (each > 8,000 sqm) at 1.8A Marks: 2.5 Evidentiary requirement: The client completion certificate must state the laboratory built-up area — a generic statement such as ‘laboratory building’ without area shall not be considered. In absence of such certificate, the bidder may submit the drawings of the qualifying project showing the area statement. It can be a standalone laboratory building, part of an academic building or aggregate of several laboratory buildings.	similar research spaces) shall be counted as laboratory built-up area. Marks: 3.0 Ref: 1.8B Description: For double the area (> 16,000 sqm) in any single project at 1.8A Marks: 2.5 Ref: 1.8C Description: For two or more such projects (each > 8,000 sqm) at 1.8A Marks: 2.5 Evidentiary requirement (revised): The client completion certificate must state the laboratory built-up area, and, where the work was executed through a sub-consultant, shall additionally identify the sub-consultant and confirm that the scope was genuinely part of the bidder’s engagement on that project — a generic statement such as ‘laboratory building’, without area, shall not be considered. In the absence of such a certificate, the bidder may submit the drawings of the qualifying project showing the area statement. The laboratory complex may be a stand-alone building, part of an academic building, or an aggregate of several laboratory buildings within the same project. Aggregation across distinct, separately executed projects is not permitted; each project claimed under 1.8C must independently meet the 8,000 sqm threshold.

17. Criterion 2.1 — Turnover (Correction of Typographical Carry-Overs), Page 27

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
Criterion 2.1 — Turnover — Max Score 20.0 Ref: 2.1A Description: Eligibility floor: Average Annual Turnover ≥ Rs. 9 Cr ... — 8.0 marks. Ref: 2.1B Description: Marks scale up linearly from Rs. 9 Cr to Rs. 18 Cr: Marks = $12.5 \times [(Turnover - 9) \div Rs. 9 Cr]$, capped at 12.5 — up to 12.0 marks. Subtotal — Criteria 2: (21.0 + 9.0)	Criterion 2.1 — Turnover — Max Score 20.0 Ref: 2.1A Description: Eligibility floor: Average Annual Turnover ≥ Rs. 9 Cr, computed over the best 7 of the preceding 9 Financial Years (bidder may exclude up to 2 Financial Years of its choice from the 9-year lookback window), which shall be from consultancy service contracts. Marks: 8.0 Ref: 2.1B (revised) Description: Marks scale up linearly from Rs. 9 Cr to Rs. 18 Cr: Marks = $12.0 \times [(Turnover - 9) \div 9]$, capped at 12.0 (Turnover in Rs. Crore). Marks: up to 12.0 Criterion 2.2 (Net Worth) — Max Score 10.0 (unchanged).

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
	Subtotal — Criteria 2: 20.0 + 10.0 = 30.0. TOTAL (Criteria 1 + Criteria 2): 70.0 + 30.0 = 100.0. <i>The earlier figures “21.0 + 9.0” and “capped at 12.5” were typographical carry-overs from an earlier draft and stand corrected.</i>

PART D — TERMS OF REFERENCE (SECTION V)

18. Cl. 4.1 — GRIHA registration and certification costs, Page 32

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
No provision in the EoI on the cost of GRIHA registration, site visits or certification.	The cost of GRIHA registration, expenses of site visits by the GRIHA team, and GRIHA certification fees shall be borne by IIT Goa.

19. Cl. 4.2, Item 6 — Vetting fees, Page 34

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“Prepare Good-for-Construction (GFC) drawings, detailed estimates, and BOQs for all Phase-I works ... All structural design and drawings shall be vetted by an IIT/IISc as approved by the Institute; vetting fees shall be reimbursed on actuals.”	“Prepare Good-for-Construction (GFC) drawings, detailed estimates, and BOQs for all Phase-I works ... All structural design and drawings shall be vetted by an IIT/IISc as approved by the Institute; vetting fees for both structural and MEP vetting shall be reimbursed on actuals.”

20. Cl. 4.3, Item 4 — As-built drawings, Page 35

Existing Provision	Revised Provision (as amended)
“Prepare as-built architectural drawings for every completed building, facility, service, and infrastructure element of Phase-I, and submit them in hard copy and editable digital format (AutoCAD/Revit).”	“Prepare as-built architectural drawings for every completed building, facility, service, and infrastructure element of Phase-I, and submit them in hard copy and editable digital format (AutoCAD/Revit). The as-built MEP drawings shall be prepared by the Contractor and reviewed by the Consultant. ”

This Corrigendum shall form part of the EoI document and shall be read in conjunction with it and the Pre-bid responses. All other terms and conditions of the EoI remain unchanged.

Sr. Executive Engineer

Indian Institute of Technology Goa

Copy to: Website / CPP Portal (for publication) and file

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GOA - EoI for Appointment of Architect
Compilation of Pre-Bid Queries submitted by Bidders (EoI No. IITGoa/IWD/CDP/2026-27/14)

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
1	Cl. 3.1 (Eligibility Criteria), Page No. 10	Requested that Joint Ventures/Consortium be considered eligible to apply.	No change in EoI Conditions.
2	Cl. 3.1 (Eligibility Criteria), Page No. 10 & 40	Submitted that the bidder is an Architectural and Engineering Consultancy firm holding valid PAN, TAN, GST and CoA registrations, and that EPF, ESI and Labour registrations are generally applicable to contractors/PMC agencies and may not be applicable to consultancy firms. Requested that these requirements be removed and a declaration confirming their non-applicability be allowed.	ESI, EPF and Labour regulations are not mandatory requirements for evaluation.
3	Part A, Clause 3.1(2) (Sub-consultants), Page 10	Requested clarification on whether formal MoUs/agreements along with profiles and experience certificates of proposed sub-consultants need to be submitted at the EoI stage or during the second (RfP) stage.	During the RfP Stage.
4	Clause 3.2 Subconsultants (page 10) and and 3.0 Eligibility - Nature of Specialized Consultant eligible as sub-consultants (page 18)	1) Structural design is also a specialised design consultancy and we request to be permitted a Sub-consultant. 2) We request that all Design consultants as may be required for purpose of design should be considered as sub-consultants. 3) We are Master Planners and Architectural design consultancy firm. We can appoint all other design sub-consultants for the project. Please confirm this is acceptable.	1: Structural Design shall also be considered as a Specialised Service and sub-consultants shall be permitted. 2 and 3: Only the services mentioned under Cl.3.2, with addition as Structural Design shall be permitted to engage qualified sub-consultants.
5	No consolidated exclusion list is given; sub-consultant categories permitted (Cl 3.2) are all consultant-appointed, not client-appointed exclusions.	[Liasoning] Please share an explicit list of services/consultants that are excluded from the Consultant's scope and will instead be appointed directly by the Institute (e.g., land surveyor, soil-investigation agency, Liaison Architect, Quantity Surveyor/PMC, structural peer-reviewer, Environmental Clearance consultant, and vendor-driven systems such as irrigation/horticulture/pool contractors).	No change in EoI Conditions.
6	Not addressed	[Liasoning] Is an exclusivity letter required from proposed sub-consultants (MEP, BIM, GRIHA, etc.), and if so, is such exclusivity project-specific, or would it prevent the same sub-consultant from supporting other bidders across different disciplines?	Will be clarified at RfP stage.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
7	Signage/wayfinding appears within the External Development marking-matrix components (implying in-scope); acoustics and specialist lighting design are not addressed; no price schedule yet exists at EoI stage (fee mechanics come with RfP).	[Commercial] Please confirm whether specialist sub-consultant scopes not explicitly enumerated in Cl 3.2 (e.g., acoustics, specialist lighting design, signage/wayfinding design) are expected to be included within the Consultant's quoted fee.	Yes. The assignment is for Comprehensive Consultancy Services.
8	Not mentioned.	[Liasoning] Is there any preferred/empanelled list of sub-consultants (structural vetting agency, MEP, GRIHA, BIM, etc.) that the Institute requires or recommends be engaged?	Will be clarified at RfP stage.
9	Clause 2.1 (EoI Submission Formats & DSC)	The complete EoI submission, including prescribed formats, project information, company documents, audited reports and balance sheets, may comprise approximately 300 to 400 pages. We understand that all submission pages may be manually signed and stamped by the authorised signatory and scanned for submission, without applying a separate Digital Signature Certificate (DSC) to each page. The DSC will be used for uploading and submitting the documents on the CPP Portal. Kindly confirm this understanding. We would also like to clarify that our organisation already has a valid registered DSC in the name of one of our directors (AA). However, the assigned signatory for this project is another director (BB). All documents will therefore be signed and stamped by director BB, who has been authorised by the Board of Directors via power of Attorney, including director AA, to act as the authorised signatory for this project. Kindly confirm whether the documents signed and stamped by director BB may be uploaded and submitted using the registered DSC of director AA.	1. Physical signing/stamping + scan is acceptable; DSC is only for portal-level submission — consistent with Section on Signing and Uploading of EoIs. 2. You may ensure that the Board Resolution/Power of Attorney explicitly authorises the DSC-holder (AA) to submit on the portal, in addition to authorising BB to sign the documents — and that both authorisations are included in the "authenticated copy" of the authorisation submitted with the bid. With that on record, using AA's registered DSC to upload documents signed by BB is acceptable.
10	Item 5 (page 13) and 7.0 (EMD) (page 20)	We request that EMD be not applicable for purpose of EOI. This may be applicable in the form of physical Bank Guarantee during the RFP process.	EoI Conditions prevail.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
11	Page No. 13 & Page No. 20 — EMD / Bid Security	We request you to kindly consider exemption for EMD / Processing Fees for MSME registered firms.	Eol Conditions prevail.
12	Page 4, 13 (Cl. 4 - EMD Submission)	We kindly request that consider that the original EMD may be submitted within 7 days from the bid submission due date.	Bidders shall submit the physical instrument of EMD within 7 (Seven) days of submission deadline.
13	General (Extension of Time)	We would request you to provide extension of time up to 15th October 2026.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
14	General Clause (Bid Extension Request)	We request that a minimum of 15 days be provided after the publication of pre-bid clarifications/responses to enable bidders to incorporate the same into their technical and commercial submissions. Kindly consider and confirm.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
15	Section III – Appendix, Cl. 2.0 (Critical Dates) & Cl. 4.0 (Obtaining the Eol Document and Clarifications), Pages 18–19	Considering the comprehensive nature of the Eol, the requirement for a site visit, compilation of project-specific credentials and supporting certificates for various marking criteria, coordination with specialised sub-consultants, and the fact that replies to the pre-bid queries/corrigendum are yet to be published, requested that IIT Goa consider extending the Eol submission due date by at least two (02) weeks from the date of publication of the replies to pre-bid queries/latest corrigendum.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
16	Eol Submission Schedule, Page 18	In view of the upcoming festive season and associated holidays, bidders may require additional time for preparation, compilation, internal approvals and submission of the Eol documents. Requested that the Authority extend the Eol submission deadline and the deadline for submission of hard copies by at least 15 days, to enable interested bidders to submit their proposals properly and within the prescribed requirements.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
17	General	Pelase allow extension of time by 2 weeks for submission of EOI.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
18	Page No. 18 — Eol Submission Closing Date & Time	We kindly request you to extend the bid submission date by 2 weeks.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
19	General Clause on Bid Submission Due Date Extension	Requested that a minimum of 15 days be provided after publication of pre-bid clarifications/responses, to enable bidders to incorporate the same into their technical and commercial submissions. Kindly consider and confirm.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
20	Section III: Appendix, Cl. 7.0 (Bid Security / EMD), Page No. 20	Requested that the EMD requirement be waived at the Eol stage and that the shortlisted bidders be allowed to submit the EMD at the RFP stage.	No change in Eol Conditions.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
21	Page 11 (Form of Contract - Fee Ceiling)	The consultancy fee is stated as not exceeding 5% of Bid Value or Completion Cost, whichever is less. Kindly clarify whether the 5% ceiling is applicable to the entire comprehensive consultancy scope including Master Planning and construction-stage association.	Details will be given in the RfP document
22	Page 21 (Cl. 8 - Sanctioned Cost)	Kindly provide the estimated/sanctioned project cost for Phase-I for assessment of the consultancy scope and fee implications.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
23	Section III – Appendix, Cl. 8.0 (About RFP) & Section V – Terms of Reference, Pages 21 & 30	For better understanding of the magnitude of the assignment and anticipated consultancy services, requested that IIT Goa provide the estimated/sanctioned construction cost or approximate project cost for Phase-I development.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
24	General	Please clarify the Project value ie. Construction Cost of the project.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
25	Fee mechanics are expressly deferred: "Details will be given in the RfP document" (Form of Contract) and the "detailed ToR, deliverables, staffing, programme and remuneration structure may be refined in the RFP" (Cl 5).	[Commercial] Will the payment-milestone and deliverable schedule (to be detailed in the RfP) define each stage's timeline as running from the date of LOA/Work Order issue, or from completion of the preceding stage? Requesting this be stated unambiguously and consistently across the RfP.	Details will be furnished in the RfP document.
26	Fee mechanics are expressly deferred: "Details will be given in the RfP document" (Form of Contract) and the "detailed ToR, deliverables, staffing, programme and remuneration structure may be refined in the RFP" (Cl 5).	[Commercial] Requesting that the RfP/Agreement include a defined mechanism for extension of time and corresponding fee adjustment where delays arise from causes not attributable to the Consultant (e.g., delayed stakeholder approvals, statutory clearances, or Client-side decisions).	Details will be furnished in the RfP document.
27	Not applicable/specified at EoI stage; expected to be detailed in the RfP.	[Technical] For the RfP-stage presentation, please confirm if the same will be accounted for any remuneration.	Details will be given in the RfP document

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
28	General (Survey Data)	Topographical and geotechnical survey data, including soft copies in CAD, shall be provided to the Consultant.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
29	Page 30-31 (Site Information - CAD Survey)	Kindly provide the site survey in editable CAD format indicating boundaries, contours, existing buildings, roads, utilities, trees and other relevant site features.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
30	General – Site Information	Requested that a site plan of the campus land be shared.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
31	General	Please clarify that all topographical and tree surveys, geotechnical tests, any tests/studies, etc shall be carried out by the Client.	Details will be given in the RfP document
32	Not addressed in EoI	[Liasoning] Please confirm that all site surveys and baseline studies (topographic, utility mapping, geotechnical, hydrological, environmental-sensitivity) will be commissioned and provided by the Client/Institute, with the Consultant's role limited to using the resulting data for design purposes.	Will be clarified during RfP stage.
33	Not addressed	[Commercial] Please confirm whether traffic/access surveys of existing site and approach-road conditions fall within the Consultant's scope, or are to be separately commissioned by the Institute.	Yes. The assignment is for Comprehensive Consultancy Services.
34	Related to Query 11/14; not explicitly confirmed.	[Liasoning] Please confirm that land survey, boundary demarcation, and related legal/statutory land documentation will be conducted by the Institute or its appointed agencies, with the Consultant's role limited to design development based on the information so provided.	Topographical survey, unless otherwise specified in RfP and land demarcation are not in the Appointed Architect's scope.
35	Section IV, Pg 23 (CoA Registration Criterion)	We would like to submit that we are an engineering consultancy organization employing multiple architects who are duly registered with the Council of Architecture (CoA). In view of this, we request that the eligibility criterion stating that 'The Firm's Owner, Partner, Director, or Managing Director must be an Architect registered with the Council of Architecture (CoA)' be waived. We further request that engineering consultancy firms having qualified architects registered with CoA on their payroll be considered eligible to participate in the tender. Please confirm.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
36	Section IV – Qualification Criteria (Phasing); General	Is the development envisaged to be constructed at one go or in two phases, as done at several other IITs? If constructed in phases, can the qualifying eligibility parameters be reduced accordingly?	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
37	Eligibility Criteria (Bidding Entity)	We kindly request you to allow use of Parent Company credentials for this bid. We are the Indian Subsidiary of Manchester, UK based Building Design Partnership.	Credentials shall be in the Bidder's name only.
38	Section IV: Qualification Criteria and Marking Matrix, Page No. 23	Bidder submits it is an engineering consultancy organization employing multiple architects duly registered with CoA. Requested that the requirement for the Firm's Owner/Partner/Director/MD to be a CoA-registered Architect be waived, and that engineering consultancy firms with qualified CoA-registered architects on payroll be considered eligible. Please confirm.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
39	Section IV, Criteria 1: General and Similar Experience, Page No. 23	Requested that the minimum experience requirement be reduced from 20 (Twenty) years to 15 (Fifteen) years of experience in Consultancy Services.	EoI Conditions prevail.
40	Section IV, Pg 24 (Master Plan Experience)	We understand that, under the subject eligibility criteria, any large-scale project meeting the prescribed minimum area requirement shall be considered eligible. Further, we understand that Township projects, IT campuses, or similar developments where external development and infrastructure works have been executed would also qualify under this criterion, provided they satisfy the stipulated area requirements. Please clarify.	The definition is anchored to "educational institutions and similar large developments" with the stated composition of uses (academic, hostels, staff quarters, etc.); it is not framed generically around Townships or IT campuses as such. Large developments constituting the stated composition of uses shall be considered for evaluation.
41	Section IV – Qualification Criteria and Marking Matrix, Definition of "Similar Work" / Criterion 1.2, Pages 23, 25	Since the 100-acre requirement is already separately prescribed and evaluated under Criterion 1.2 (Similar Master Planning Experience), applying the same 100-acre condition to every project claimed under the other experience criteria may restrict otherwise relevant projects having the required built-up area and similar institutional facilities. Requested that the 100-acre requirement be applied specifically to Criterion 1.2 (Master Planning Experience) alone, and that other institutional/educational campus projects satisfying the prescribed built-up area and respective technical requirements be considered eligible under Criteria 1.3 to 1.8, irrespective of overall campus land area.	EoI Conditions prevail.
42	Section IV – Qualification Criteria and Marking Matrix, Definition of "Similar Work", Pages 23–24	Requested confirmation that campus development projects of any type of Educational Institution shall be considered as "Similar Work", subject to meeting the prescribed scope, area and other qualifying requirements stipulated in the EoI.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
43	Section IV: Definition of "Similar Work" (page 23)	We are Master Planners and Architectural design consultancy firm. We request to also allow 'similar work' where design sub-consultants are not appointed by us but we have completed the design coordinations. Please confirm. Also campuses may not have every facility mentioned in the definition. We request for relaxation to the terms.	EoI Conditions prevail.
44	Similar Experience — Criteria 1 – Definition of Similar Work, Page 23–24	Considering that the key components of the defined "Similar Work" involve large-scale integrated institutional planning, infrastructure, residential facilities, utilities and external development, kindly clarify whether projects of comparable scale and complexity executed for non-educational institutional developments, such as government institutions or national importance projects, may also be considered as "Similar Work". This may be permitted as such projects involve similar multidisciplinary planning, infrastructure integration and campus-scale development requirements.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
45	Section IV, Criteria 1	[Technical] Please confirm if we can submit under "similar projects" category - of similar scale and nature of campuses which could be non-educational campuses.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
46	Definition of "Similar Work", Page No. 23	Requested that the definition of "Similar Work" be expanded to also include Hospitals and Judicial Precinct (in addition to Educational Institutions) as qualifying categories of similar large developments.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
47	Definition of "Similar Work", Page No. 23	Requested that the definition of "Similar Work" be expanded to also include Industrial Parks/Integrated Townships (mixed use)/IT Campuses/Commercial Development, in addition to educational institutions and similar large developments.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
48	Definition of "Similar Work", Pages No. 23-24	Submitted that, as the EoI requires experience in very large-scale development projects, only a limited number of such projects have been undertaken/awarded and only a limited number of firms may possess the specified credentials. Requested that the definition of "Similar Work" be broadened to include Educational / Mixed-use Project / Residential / Township, to facilitate wider participation of experienced firms and promote healthy competition.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
49	Qualification Criteria (09 Years Experience Window)	We respectfully submit that for such large-scale and significant institutional projects, experience within the last 10 years may kindly be considered. Many large projects have longer gestation periods, and in several cases completion timelines were impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, causing delays in handover and certification. Expanding the eligibility window to 10 years will ensure that relevant experience of our firm in similar completed projects can be included for evaluation.	The 9-year window (F.Y. 2017-18 to 2025-26) applies to the completion date of the similar work, not its start date. Projects commenced at any time in the past will qualify, provided they were completed within this 9-year period, subject to meeting the other prescribed qualifying parameters for the respective criterion.
50	Qualification Criteria (Project Completion Stage)	We respectfully request that projects which have achieved at least 90% completion to be considered as eligible. For large-scale institutional projects, the last 10% of works typically involve handover formalities, finishing details, and minor balance items, while the substantive design and execution scope is already accomplished. Such large projects have longer gestation periods, and in several cases completion timelines were impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, causing delays in handover and certification. Hence, allowing projects near completion to be added to this list will allow relevant experience to be added.	Projects where all scoped consultancy services have been fully completed and the project has achieved at least 90% physical progress will be considered as "completed" for eligibility purposes.
51	Definition of "Similar Work" — Look-back Period, Pages No. 23-24	Submitted that the COVID-19 pandemic significantly impacted project execution for nearly 2-3 years. Requested that the look-back period be extended from 9 years to 10 years, with the COVID-19 extension revised from 2 years to 3 years (i.e. 7-year qualifying period extended by 3 years).	EoI Conditions prevail.
52	Section IV, Pg 24 (Architectural Services Area)	(a) We would like to submit that the minimum area requirement stipulated under the subject eligibility criterion appears to be on the higher side and may restrict wider competition. In the interest of encouraging broader participation and attracting competent consultants, we request that the said criterion be relaxed to a reasonable extent. (b) Further, we request that projects related to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under this criterion, subject to meeting the relevant project scale and complexity requirements. Please clarify.	(a) Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria. (b) Please refer to Sl.No.40
53	Section IV – Qualification Criteria, Cl. 1.3 (Comprehensive Architectural Services), Page 23–25	Can the qualifying built-up area for one project be reduced?	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
54	Section IV: Definition of "Similar Work" (page 23)	Please reduce the built up area criteria to 7 lakhs sqft and also permit architectural services projects for eligibility.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
55	Definition of "Similar Work" — Note 2, Page No. 24	Requested that Note 2 be revised to read that A & B may be the same project or different projects, but shall be within the meaning of "similar work" defined above.	The said note conveys the same intent of the pre-bid request.
56	Eligibility Criteria (Certificates)	For Eligibility criteria, it is requested that Self Attested certificates or work orders / contracts of the project be allowed.	No change in evidentiary requirement with respect to eligibility criteria 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4; for 1.5, 1.7 and 1.8, Please refer to the Corrigendum.
57	Note: (page 24)	For private sector firms - how does our Chartered Account prove Clients annual turnover of Rs 500 crores. We request this be deleted and Completion certificates from reputed institutions be accepted.	EoI Conditions prevail.
58	Section IV, Note under Criteria 1, p.24	[Technical] Given the strict completion-certificate requirements (officer not below EE/GM rank; private certificates only from ≥Rs 500 Cr turnover entities), we request that self-certification or a CA-certified confirmation of payment received be accepted in lieu of a formal completion certificate for past projects where the stipulated certificate is genuinely unobtainable.	No change in evidentiary requirement with respect to eligibility criteria 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4; for 1.5, 1.7 and 1.8, Please refer to the Corrigendum.
59	Section IV, Note under Criteria 1, p.24	[Technical] Please confirm whether any relaxation of the completion-certificate requirement is available for overseas projects where an Executive-Engineer-equivalent certifying authority is not a standard practice.	Projects executed in India shall only be considered.
60	Section IV – Criteria 2: Financial Capability (Minimum Eligibility), Page 24	Can the minimum average annual turnover be reduced to Rs. 6 Crores from consultancy services completed in the last 5 years?	EoI Conditions prevail.
61	Criteria 2: Financial Capability (page 24)	We understand that a 9 cr turnover is ver low. Please increase this to 100 cr. Considering it's a 100 acre campus with the requirement of eligibility are in sqft being considereably high compared to the turnover requested.	EoI Conditions prevail.
62	Criteria No. 2 — Financial Capability (Turnover), Page No. 24	Requested that the minimum average annual turnover criterion be revised from Rs 9 Crores to Rs 5 Crores, to enable wider participation from qualified and experienced bidders while ensuring healthy competition.	EoI Conditions prevail.
63	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.1A (Years of Experience), Page 25	We request you consider 15 years instead of 20 years for Eligibility Floor as BDP Design Engineering Pvt Ltd has worked on IIT Mandi and IIT Jodhpur projects in the past already which are highly relevant to this bid.	EoI Conditions prevail.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
64	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.1 (Years of Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that the eligibility floor under 1.1A be reduced from 20 years to 15 years of established consultancy practice, and that the additional marks under 1.1B be reckoned per completed year beyond 15 years (instead of 20 years), capped at 6.0.	EoI Conditions prevail.
65	Marking Matrix, Pg 25 (Master Planning Definition)	Please clarify the definition 'similar large developments'. We understand that, large scale projects having area more than ≥ 100 acres are eligible under this criteria. Please clarify.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
66	Similar Project – Master Plan – Criteria 1.2A & 1.2B, Page 24	Kindly clarify how additional marks under Criteria 1.2B will be calculated where a single Master Plan project substantially exceeds the 100-acre threshold. For example, if a bidder has undertaken a single Master Plan covering approximately 700 acres, whether the additional area beyond 100 acres (i.e. 600 acres) will be considered for awarding additional marks equivalent to multiple 100-acre increments, subject to the stated maximum marks, or whether additional marks will be awarded only for separate Master Plan projects of 100 acres or more.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
67	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.2 (Similar Masterplanning Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that 100% marks be awarded for meeting twice the minimum eligibility criteria or more, under Criterion 1.2.	EoI Conditions prevail.
68	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.2 (Similar Master planning Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that additional marks under 1.2B be awarded at 1.5 marks for every additional 50 acres of Master Plan work (instead of every additional 100 acres), capped at 7.0.	EoI Conditions prevail.
69	Eligibility Criteria – Cl. 1.3 (Comprehensive Services)	(a) We would like to highlight that projects in a similar category under a single contract generally range from 45,000 to 60,000 sqm, as larger campus projects are executed in phases. Hence, it would be difficult to provide a single contract for a campus project with a built-up area equal to or greater than 2,29,000 sqm. (b) We request that categories such as convention centres also be permitted under this criterion. (c) We further request relaxation of the requirement to allow three projects of 50,000 sqm each.	(a) and (c) : Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria. (b) Please refer to Sl.No.40

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
70	Page 25 (Cl. 1.3 - Similar Past Experience)	The requirement of double the specified built-up area is quite high. We kindly request you to consider double the built-up area in any category at 1.3A or 2nd Project similar project 2,29,000 Sqm. We kindly request you to consider awarding marks based on a minimum built-up area of 1,00,000 sq. m. for each project, instead of considering the number of projects beyond the specified number under Category 1.3A.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
71	Marking Matrix, Pg 25 (Built-Up Area Scope)	We hereby request that projects pertaining to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under the subject criterion. Inclusion of such projects would promote broader participation by qualified and experienced consultants while maintaining the intent of the eligibility requirements. Please consider.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
72	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.3 (Similar Past Experience — Comprehensive Architectural Services), Page No. 25	Requested that 100% marks be awarded for meeting twice the minimum eligibility criteria or more, under Criterion 1.3.	EoI Conditions prevail.
73	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.3 (Similar Past Experience — Comprehensive Architectural Services), Page No. 24	Requested that the built-up area thresholds under Criterion 1.3 be revised to: one similar project $\geq 60,000$ sqm; OR two similar projects each $\geq 45,000$ sqm; OR three similar projects each $\geq 30,000$ sqm.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
74	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.3 (Similar Past Experience — Comprehensive Architectural Services) — Note, Page No. 25	Requested that the Note be revised to state that Criteria 1.2 and 1.3 may be satisfied by the same project or by different projects, provided each project claimed is within the meaning of "Similar Work" as defined.	The said note conveys the same intent of the pre-bid request.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
75	Section IV – Marking Matrix, Criteria 1.3 to 1.6, Pages 25–26	Requested confirmation that for awarding additional marks towards "double the area", it shall be sufficient if any one of the qualifying projects has double the prescribed area applicable to that category, and it is not necessary that all the projects under the respective category individually have double the prescribed area (e.g., under Criterion 1.3A, where the bidder qualifies through two projects each having built-up area $\geq 1,71,500$ sqm, if one of the two projects has built-up area $\geq 3,43,000$ sqm, the bidder shall be eligible for additional marks under Criterion 1.3B, provided the other project satisfies the minimum requirement of $\geq 1,71,500$ sqm). Requested that the same interpretation be confirmed for the corresponding "double area" provisions under Criteria 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6.	Request not accepted. Each project will be evaluated once only, under the highest single category of Criteria 1.3 to 1.6 that it satisfies on its own, and it cannot be counted again in another category or combined with another project to form a different category. Marks for "double the area" are assessed against the threshold of the category under which the project is evaluated. In the example cited, the project of 3,43,000 sqm qualifies under the "one project $\geq 2,29,000$ sqm" category, and double the area for that category is 4,58,000 sqm; it therefore does not earn additional marks under 1.3B. The project of 1,71,500 sqm, being below 2,29,000 sqm, earns no marks. The same principle applies to Criteria 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6.
76	Eligibility Criteria – Cl. 1.4 (GRIHA Experience)	We would like to highlight that the scale of projects in the GRIHA LD category is dependent more on the site area of over 100 acres than on the built-up area. Additionally, individual buildings that have received a GRIHA rating should be considered, with a built-up area ranging from 5,000 to 10,000 sqm per building. There would be very few projects in the country with a built-up area of 1,14,300 sqm that may have received GRIHA certification.	Please refer to corrigendum
77	Page 25 (Cl. 1.4 - Similar GRIHA Experience)	We kindly request you to consider a minimum built-up area of 1,71,500 sq. m. for 1st Project (1.4A), 1,37,200 sq. m. for 2nd Project (1.4B), and 1,02,900 sq. m. for 3rd Project (1.4C) for Institutional/office/Healthcare.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
78	Marking Matrix, Pg 25 (GRIHA Rated Area Scope)	We hereby request that projects pertaining to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under the subject criterion. Inclusion of such projects would promote broader participation by qualified and experienced consultants while maintaining the intent of the eligibility requirements. Please consider.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
79	Part B, Clause 1.4 (GRIHA Experience), Page 25	Requested confirmation whether provisional GRIHA/Green Building registration/pre-certification issued by the GRIHA Council (or IGBC/LEED equivalent) for ongoing projects will be considered for scoring, alongside final certificates.	Final certificates of the completed works shall only be considered for evaluation.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
80	1.4 Similar Griha (page 25)	1) We request to accept projects which are currently in design also. Many Institutions do not pursue Griha certification. 2) We request to all any category large campus projects for this Griha marking.	Please refer to Sl.No 76 and 79.
81	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that the GRIHA-rated area thresholds be revised to: $\geq 50,000$ sqm in one project; OR $\geq 40,000$ sqm each across two projects; OR $\geq 25,000$ sqm each across three projects.	Please refer to Sl.No 76.
82	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience), Page No. 25	Submitted that GRIHA rating criteria and assessment norms are based on applicable sustainability parameters and do not vary solely on the basis of built-up area; achieving a GRIHA 4-Star rating is independent of building size. Requested that built-up area be removed from the clause, while retaining the requirement of a minimum GRIHA 3-Star rating or equivalent, to enable wider participation.	Please refer to Sl.No 76.
83	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that the GRIHA-rated area thresholds under Criterion 1.4 be revised to: $\geq 60,000$ sqm in one project; OR $\geq 45,000$ sqm each across two projects; OR $\geq 30,000$ sqm each across three projects.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
84	Criterion 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience), Page No. 25 [Letter No. M&A/2026/IITGoa/Pre-bid/003 dated 26.09.2026]	Bidder submits that green building projects in India and internationally are also widely undertaken under IGBC and LEED rating systems. Requested that projects certified under GRIHA, IGBC and LEED all be considered as eligible green building experience under Criterion 1.4, subject to meeting the prescribed built-up area and other requirements, with the marking provisions under 1.4A, 1.4B and 1.4C suitably applied to equivalent IGBC/LEED-rated projects.	Equivalent rating systems of LEED/IGBC will be considered. Please refer to corrigendum.
85	Criterion 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience) — Ongoing Projects, Page No. 25 [Letter No. M&A/2026/IITGoa/Pre-bid/003 dated 26.09.2026]	Requested that ongoing projects registered/under certification with GRIHA, IGBC or LEED also be considered for evaluation under Criterion 1.4, subject to submission of supporting documents such as work orders/agreements, project area statements, and evidence of the consultant's scope and stage of services.	Request not accepted.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
86	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.4 (Similar GRIHA Experience), Page No. 25	Requested that (a) the GRIHA experience criterion not be restricted to "Similar Works" and that all project typologies having GRIHA / LEED / IGBC 3-Star or equivalent certification be considered, as the process and requirements for obtaining green building certification are broadly similar across typologies; and (b) the built-up area thresholds under 1.4A be reduced from 2,29,000 / 1,71,500 / 1,14,300 sqm to 60,000 / 45,000 / 30,000 sqm respectively, since built-up area is already considered separately under the BIM and MEP Services experience criteria.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
87	Eligibility Criteria – Cl. 1.5 (BIM Experience)	We would like to highlight that many projects completed more than Nine years ago (and practically initiated 10–15 years back) did not have BIM requirements, as such mandates were not in place at the time. These projects were nevertheless large-scale institutional works comparable in complexity and relevance. Hence, requiring BIM LOD certifications for such projects would not be possible. Additionally, in case of EPC (III), the architectural consultant's BIM responsibility shall be limited to BIM LOD 300 (GFC LEVEL), because LOD 400 (fabrication drawings) and LOD 500 (as-built model) shall remain entirely within the contractor's scope. While we have executed several projects using the BIM platform and can provide project names with self-certification, it may not be possible to obtain certificates from clients, as BIM deliverables have not historically been a mandatory contractual requirement. We therefore propose to submit self-attested details of BIM projects executed in lieu of client certification.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
88	Marking Matrix, Pg 26 (BIM Modelled Area Scope)	We hereby request that projects pertaining to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under the subject criterion. Inclusion of such projects would promote broader participation by qualified and experienced consultants while maintaining the intent of the eligibility requirements. Please consider.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
89	Part B, Clause 1.5 (Similar BIM Experience), Page 26	Since BIM modelling is predominantly an active design, coordination, and pre-construction delivery tool, requested that the Authority allow ongoing projects where the LOD 300 multi-disciplinary BIM model design/coordination stage has been completed and approved by the Client, or projects where overall physical execution is ongoing/in-progress with major BIM milestones delivered.	Ongoing projects will be considered, provided all scoped consultancy services, including LOD 300 multi-disciplinary BIM modelling, have been completed and physical progress is not less than 90%, as certified by the Client. Self-certified BIM records under the corrigendum may be used only to evidence the BIM-modelled area, LOD and disciplines coordinated; completion of services and physical progress must in every case be certified by the Client. Please refer to corrigendum.
90	1.5 Similar BIM Experience (page 26)	As BIM has not been used in Institutional projects, we request to delete this criteria.	Request not accepted. Please refer to the Corrigendum.
91	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.5 (Similar BIM Experience), Page No. 26	Requested that (a) ongoing projects also be considered under this criterion, and (b) a Work Order/Agreement from the client explicitly stating (i) the total built-up area of the host project, (ii) the built-up area delivered through coordinated multidisciplinary BIM, and (iii) the disciplines coordinated, be accepted as evidence in lieu of a client certificate.	Please refer to the Corrigendum. Ongoing projects will be considered, provided all scoped consultancy services, including LOD 300 multi-disciplinary BIM modelling, have been completed and physical progress is not less than 90%, as certified by the Client. Self-certified BIM records under the corrigendum may be used only to evidence the BIM-modelled area, LOD and disciplines coordinated; completion of services and physical progress must in every case be certified by the Client.
92	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.5 (Similar BIM Experience), Page No. 26	Requested that (a) the third-category threshold under Criterion 1.5 be revised from $\geq 30,000$ sqm each (three projects) to $\geq 20,000$ sqm each, and (b) design-completed projects as well as construction-in-progress projects both be considered for this criterion.	Please refer to the Corrigendum; the LOD 300 requirement under Criterion 1.5 is not relaxed.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
93	Criterion 1.5 (Similar BIM Experience), Page No. 26 [Letter No. M&A/2026/IITGoa/Pre-bid/002 dated 26.09.2026]	Bidder submits that BIM is a recently introduced concept in Government projects in India, with very few projects where the client has issued a separate BIM-specific certificate; for International projects, clients do not issue completion certificates in the prescribed format even though the BIM scope is complete and supported by project records. Requested that, in both cases (International/India), alternative evidence be permitted in lieu of the prescribed certificate — specifically the BIM Execution Plan (BEP)/AIM (Asset Information Model), work order/appointment letter, and self-certified documents of the BIM Consultant. Requested a suitable clarification/corrigendum for uniform understanding by all bidders.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
94	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.5 (Similar BIM Experience), Page No. 26	Requested that (a) the BIM experience criterion not be restricted to "Similar Works" and BIM experience across all project typologies be considered; and (b) projects executed at LOD 200 or above be considered, instead of restricting the requirement to LOD 300 or above.	Please refer to the Corrigendum; the LOD 300 requirement under Criterion 1.5 is not relaxed.
95	Marking Matrix, Pg 26 (MEP Design Scope)	We hereby request that projects pertaining to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under the subject criterion. Inclusion of such projects would promote broader participation by qualified and experienced consultants while maintaining the intent of the eligibility requirements. Please consider.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
96	Marking Matrix, Pg 26 (External Development Scope)	We hereby request that projects pertaining to Commercial Developments, IT Campuses, and Assembly Buildings be considered eligible under the subject criterion. Inclusion of such projects would promote broader participation by qualified and experienced consultants while maintaining the intent of the eligibility requirements. Please consider.	Please refer to Sl.No. 40
97	Part B, Clause 1.7 (Similar External Development & Landscape Experience), Page 26	In cases where the Client Completion Certificate does not specifically itemise the 15 components, but the RFP/Tender Document, Work Order/Agreement and approved Scope of Services/BOQ clearly indicate the relevant external development and landscape components, requested that the Authority permit submission of such documents as supporting evidence for Clause 1.7, to enable bidders to establish actual scope of work executed even where the Client's completion certificate is issued in a generic format.	Please refer to the Corrigendum.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
98	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.7 (Similar External Development & Landscape Experience), Page No. 26	Requested that the "Similar Work" restriction and the documentary requirement for External Development & Landscape experience be relaxed. Submitted that older completion certificates generally do not provide a component-wise breakup and only mention the scope broadly (e.g. "Landscape Works", "External Development Works"); requested that such certificates be accepted as valid experience to facilitate wider participation. The bidder's marked-up copy also replaces the words "comprehensive coverage" in 1.7B with "External Development".	Please refer to the Corrigendum.
99	Part B, Clause 1.8 (Laboratory Experience), Page 27	Request 1: As per Clause 3.1(2), specialised sub-consultants are permitted for specialised scope like Lab Infrastructure — requested clarification that if a bidder engages a specialised Lab Consultant, the credentials/experience of the proposed specialised sub-consultant will be considered for scoring under Criterion 1.8. Request 2: Alternatively, requested relaxation/reduction of the threshold for single-project lab area from 8,000 sqm to 3,000 sqm, or consideration of cumulative lab space across multiple academic blocks.	1. With reference to Criterion 1.8 (Lab Experience): similar to the treatment at 1.6 (MEP Experience), Criterion 1.8 will be amended by way of Corrigendum to permit consultancy experience for laboratory works executed by the bidder directly or through a sub-consultant engaged by the bidder. Bidders are advised to refer to the Corrigendum for the revised criterion, including the evidentiary requirements applicable to sub-consultant-executed work. Request 2: Request for reduction in specified area not accepted. The existing threshold under Criterion 1.8A remains unchanged. It is clarified that aggregation of built-up area from multiple laboratory buildings within the same qualifying project (e.g., across academic blocks on one campus) is already permitted under 1.8A; aggregation across distinct, separately-executed projects is not permitted, and each project claimed under 1.8C must independently meet the 8,000 sqm threshold.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
100	1,8 Lab Experience (page 27)	Requirement of 8,000sqm of lab space is a unique and large eligibility requirement. We request to accept Labs designed in campuses irrespective of the size. Please confirm.	Request not accepted. Please refer to the Corrigendum.
101	Criterion 1.8 (Lab Experience), Page No. 27 [Letter No. M&A/2026/IITGoa/Pre-bid/003 dated 26.09.2026]	Requested that, to enable wider participation by consultants with substantial and relevant laboratory planning/design experience, one project having laboratory facilities of at least 5,000 sqm built-up area (whether standalone or forming part of any institutional building) be considered eligible experience under Criterion 1.8A, and that the criterion be suitably amended. Requested a suitable clarification/corrigendum for uniform understanding by all bidders.	Request not accepted.
102	Marking Matrix, Cl. 1.8 (Lab Experience), Page No. 27	Submitted an understanding that Medical Research Facility area may also be considered under Laboratory Built-up Area, as Medical Research Facilities generally comprise laboratories and similar research spaces. Requested that Medical Research Facilities be considered as eligible Laboratory experience under this criterion, as is commonly done in various tenders.	Please refer to corrigendum
103	Page 27 (Cl. 2.1B - Turnover Marking)	We kindly request that the marks be scaled up linearly from Rs. 9 Crores to Rs. 15 Crores, instead of Rs. 9 Crores to Rs. 18 Crores.	EoI Conditions prevail.
104	Marking Matrix – Turnover – Clause 2.1, Page 27	The marks indicated under Clause 2.1A and Clause 2.1B and the corresponding subtotal under the Financial Capability criteria appear to have an inconsistency. Kindly clarify the final marks allocated for the Turnover criterion and the exact formula to be adopted for evaluation.	The reference to "21.0 + 9.0" in the subtotal line, and the "capped at 12.5" figure within Criterion 2.1B, are typographical carry-overs from an earlier draft and stand corrected. The applicable marks are: Criterion 2.1 (Turnover) — Max Score 20.0, comprising 2.1A = 8.0 and 2.1B = up to 12.0 (Marks = $12.0 \times [(Turnover - 9) \div 9]$, capped at 12.0); Criterion 2.2 (Net Worth) — Max Score 10.0, unchanged. This correction will be issued by way of Corrigendum.
105	General (GRIHA Fees)	The cost of GRIHA registration, site visits, and certification fees shall be paid by the Client.	The cost of GRIHA registration, expenses of site visits by GRIHA team, and certification fees shall be paid by IIT Goa.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
106	GRIHA compliance is embedded in the design scope; facilitation/registration fee responsibility is not addressed	[Commercial] Please confirm that GRIHA certification facilitation (documentation, registration, and any associated GRIHA Council fees) is excluded from the Consultant's scope/fee.	Please refer to Sl.No. 105.
107	Cl 2(c), p.29; Cl 4.1.6, p.32	[Technical] Please confirm that GRIHA 5-Star is the only green-building certification target for this project, and that no additional certification (e.g., WELL, LEED, IGBC, EDGE, Net Zero) is required.	The project will be registered for GRIHA certification.
108	Not addressed	[Legal] Please confirm that a Commissioning Agent (CxA), if required for GRIHA 5-Star certification, will be appointed independently by the Institute as a third party, and will not form part of the Consultant's scope.	No. Obtaining GRIHA certification is the responsibility of the Appointed Architect.
109	Cl 2(d), p.29; Cl 4.2.7, p.34	[Technical] Please share the draft BIM standards, Employer's Information Requirements (EIR), and BIM Execution Plan (BEP) template, with expected LOD per discipline, ahead of the RfP/commercial submission.	Will be clarified at RfP stage.
110	Not addressed.	[Technical] Please clarify the BIM model acceptance matrix, approval workflow, quality-compliance checklist, review timelines, and any deemed-approval provisions for BIM submittals.	Will be clarified at RfP stage.
111	Page 29 (Cl. 2(f) - Applicable Code)	The clause refers to 'NBCS-2026'. Kindly clarify the applicable code/standard intended to be referred to.	NBCS-2026 shall mean National Building Construction Standards-2026 published by the Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS).
112	Cl 3 (Background), p.30	[Technical] Please confirm the current status of statutory approvals for the permanent campus (Goa TCPD planning permission, Environmental Clearance, Fire NOC, Panchayat NOC, AAI height clearance) - i.e., whether any have already been initiated/obtained, or all are to be pursued afresh by the appointed Consultant.	None. All required approvals as stated in EoI shall be pursued and obtained by the Appointed Architect.
113	Undulating/rocky terrain described narratively; no survey plan referenced	[Technical] Is a topographic survey plan of the 115.15-acre site already available? If so, will it be shared with the shortlisted Consultants at the RfP stage?	Will be furnished/clarified during RfP stage.
114	Site is described as having "rocky strata" but no geotech report is referenced	[Technical] Are soil investigation/geotechnical reports for the site already available with the Institute? If not, will these be commissioned by the Client and shared with the Consultant, or is this to be assumed within the Consultant's scope?	Not available at this stage. Will be clarified during RfP stage.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
115	Cl 3, p.30; Cl 4.1.2, p.31	[Technical] Require a consolidated site-constraints drawing/report identifying any non-buildable zones, eco-sensitive areas, natural drains/nalas, HT transmission lines, CRZ, or other statutory restrictions applicable to the site. Will it be shared with the shortlisted Consultants at the RfP stage?	Details will be given in the RfP document
116	Page 30 (Cl. 4 - Scope / EPC Mode II or III)	The EoI states that the EPC construction contract may be Mode II or Mode III, which will be confirmed in the RfP. Kindly clarify whether the financial proposal/consultancy fee structure at RfP stage will be separately defined for Mode II and Mode III considering the substantial difference in Consultant's scope.	Financial Bid will be part of the RfP.
117	General	Please share copies of CPWD Works Manual 2026 so bidder can understand EPC Mode II and Mode III requirements	May please download from the CPWD website.
118	Cl 4 (Note on Delivery Mode), p.30; Cl 4.2.6, p.34	[Technical] Given that the EPC delivery mode (Mode II or Mode III per CPWD Works Manual 2026, s.4.8) will only be confirmed at RfP stage, and this materially changes the Consultant's scope (structural design, GFC drawings, vetting, and BIM LOD 300 vs LOD 400), can the Institute indicate at this stage which mode is more likely to be adopted, to allow firms to plan their team composition and pricing approach?	This information has no significance at EoI stage. Price bid is part of RfP.
119	No Principal/Executive structure exists here, but an analogous scope-shift risk exists if EPC Mode II is assumed for pricing and Mode III is later confirmed (adding full structural design/GFC/LOD 400 responsibility).	[Commercial] If the EPC delivery mode is confirmed as Mode III (rather than Mode II) after EoI/RfP submission, thereby adding full structural design, GFC drawings, vetting coordination, and LOD 400 BIM to the Consultant's scope, please clarify the mechanism for corresponding fee adjustment.	Details will be given in the RfP document
120	Section V – Terms of Reference, Cl. 4.1 (Preparation of Detailed Master Plan for Phase-I and Phase-II), Page 31	For better understanding of the existing site conditions and for planning the site visit, requested that IIT Goa provide the existing site plan/survey plan showing the site boundary, contours, existing buildings/structures, existing village road, access roads and other major existing features, preferably in PDF/CAD format.	Details will be given in the RfP document
121	General – Design Brief	Requested that the design brief be shared.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
122	Cl 4.1.2, p.31; Cl 4.2.4, p.34	[Technical] Please share a detailed design brief/area-program statement (facility-wise and room-wise BUA break-up) for Phase-I and the incremental Phase-II requirement, to the extent this is available ahead of the RFP.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
123	Cl 4.1.2, p.31; Cl 4.1.5, p.31; Cl 4.2.4, p.34	[Technical] Please provide detailed housing program requirements – headcount, gender split, unit-mix/sharing ratios for student hostels; population and category break-up (senior/junior staff, visiting faculty) for staff housing; and occupancy profile for the guest house – within the aggregate design population of ~7,500 stated in the ToR.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
124	Cl 4.1.2, p.31; Cl 4.2.4, p.34	[Technical] Please confirm the target faculty/staff housing population, resident-to-total-staff ratio, and the percentage of staff expected to require on-site accommodation.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
125	Not detailed in EoI	[Technical] Please share the intended unit-mix/configurations and resident categories (e.g., senior staff, junior staff, visiting/guest faculty) for the staff housing component.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
126	Boys'/girls' hostels and married-scholar housing are confirmed in scope; headcount/gender split/sharing ratio are not given.	[Technical] Please provide the total hostel headcount, gender-wise split, and sharing ratio (e.g., single/twin/triple) for student housing, and how sharing type is expected to map to resident category (undergraduate vs. postgraduate/research scholar).	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
127	Not addressed	[Technical] Please confirm the intended toilet/bath service model (attached vs. common) for each student-housing unit type.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
128	FAR/FSI is to be "proposed" by the Consultant as part of Development Control Regulations, not a fixed given figure	[Technical] Please confirm the permissible FSI/FAR applicable to the site under Goa TCPD regulations for Phase I and II.	Bidder may obtain this information from relevant authorities of Government of Goa.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
129	Not addressed; Consultant is instead required to design WTP/STP/power/drainage systems from scratch for the campus	[Technical] Are the external utility connection/tie-in points (municipal water supply, grid power feed, sewage outfall, stormwater discharge point) for the site already identified and mapped?	No.
130	Cl 4.1.5, p.32	[Commercial] Please confirm the scope boundary for vendor-driven/specialist systems – specifically security systems and AV – i.e., whether these are to be designed by the Consultant, recommended by the Consultant but executed by specialist vendors, or excluded entirely from Consultant scope.	Yes. The assignment is for Comprehensive Consultancy Services.
131	Electrical/power DBR scope is in the ToR generally; façade lighting specifically and ECBC compliance responsibility are not separately addressed.	[Technical] Please confirm whether façade lighting design and ECBC/energy-code compliance sit within the Consultant's architectural/MEP scope, or are to be separately commissioned by the Institute.	Yes. The assignment is for Comprehensive Consultancy Services.
132	General	Please clarify that the Statutory Consultant shall be appointed by Client to prepare all the Statutory drawings and liaison including EIA, NOC, CRZ, Heritage, Civil aAviation, Fire/etc. Design consultant will provide the base drawings to the Clients Statutory Consultant.	EoI Conditions prevail. It is the complete responsibility of the Appointed Architect. No separate consultants shall be engaged by IIT Goa.
133	Statutory Approvals — Clause 4.1(9), Page 32	Kindly clarify whether the Consultant's responsibility shall be limited to the preparation and submission of documentation and coordination with the concerned statutory authorities, while the liaison/approval follow-up work with the respective authorities shall be undertaken by an officer/agency appointed by IIT Goa. We request the Authority to kindly make suitable arrangements for the same.	EoI Conditions prevail. It is the complete responsibility of the Appointed Architect. No separate consultants shall be engaged by IIT Goa.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
134	The EoI instead places statutory approval liaison within the Firm's own scope (see Query 87)	[Legal] The ToR (Cl 4.1.9) requires the Consultant to obtain statutory/regulatory approvals (Goa TCPD), with only statutory fees borne by the Institute. Please confirm whether a separate Liaison Architect for statutory approvals will be appointed by the Institute to handle authority submissions and coordination, with the Consultant's role limited to providing design drawings/documentation in support & statutory fees, authority charges, NOCs and sanction fees borne directly by the Institute.	EoI Conditions prevail. It is the complete responsibility of the Appointed Architect. No separate consultants shall be engaged by IIT Goa.
135	The EoI instead places statutory approval liaison within the Firm's own scope (see Query 87)	[Legal] EC i.e. Environmental Clearance by MOEF consultant is not considered in our scope - the same shall be appointed directly by the Client. Similarly Fire, Pollution Control Board, Panchayat, AAI will have separate specialized consultants.	EoI Conditions prevail. It is the complete responsibility of the Appointed Architect to obtain all mentioned clearances. No separate consultants shall be engaged by IIT Goa.
136	Cl 4.1.10, p.32	[Technical] Please confirm the parking ratio/standard used to arrive at the ~1,400 ECS (ultimate) figure, and whether it diverges from the Goa TCPD default parking norms, along with any expected split between visitor and resident parking and on-grade vs. basement provision. Also, Please confirm the expected visitor-parking percentage and any requirement for on-grade vs. basement distribution of the ~1,400 ECS.	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
137	The ToR instead requires the Firm to "promptly address requirements for inputs, modifications, additional details, or phased revisions... as directed by the Institute" and "make amendments... as per the directions of the Institute" without an additional-fee carve-out. Cl 4.1.12, p.33; Cl 4.1.13, p.33	[Commercial] Cl 4.1.12/4.1.13 require the Consultant to address revisions and Master Plan amendments "as directed by the Institute" without an explicit additional-fee carve-out. Please confirm that revisions/rework arising after design freeze due to brief changes, statutory requirements, phasing changes, or Institute-driven instructions will be treated as additional scope and compensated separately, distinct from ordinary design-development iteration within the base scope.	Will be clarified at RfP stage.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
138	Not addressed	[Commercial] Please clarify the number of design iterations/revision cycles included within the agreed base scope and fee, at each design stage.	Will be clarified at RfP stage.
139	4.1.1 Strategy of Existing Buildings & Structure (Page 33)	All existing data, surveys to be provided by the Client. Health assessment agency to be appointed by the Client as various tests are required to determine the health of structures. This is a specialised agency and not in architectural designers scope. Once the requisite tests are conducted by Client, The Architecturalconsultant can assist in reviewing the same provide a reasonable strategy. Please confirm.	EoI Conditions prevail.
140	Not stated	[Technical] Is there any existing master plan, feasibility study, concept report, or Campus Vision Statement document (referenced at Cl 4.2.1) that will be shared with the shortlisted/appointed Consultant to align the new Master Plan to?	None. EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
141	Page 30-34 (Scope - Area Statement)	Kindly provide the building-wise area statement and functional programme proposed under Phase-I.	Details will be given in the RfP document
142	Cl 4.2.4, p.34	[Technical] Please confirm whether the guest house is intended as hotel-room-style or studio-apartment-style accommodation, and the expected occupancy profile (staff, visiting faculty, official guests, other).	EoI document presents the project overview. Design brief will be part of the RfP.
143	Page 32 (Cl. 10 - Vetting Fees)	Structure & MEP Vetting fees shall be borne by IIT Goa.	Vetting fees for both structural and MEP shall be reimbursed on actuals
144	6. Prepare GFC and BOQ (Page 34)	1) Please clarify that GFC and BOQ are required. 2) Vetting of structural drawings shall be in Clients scope,	EoI Conditions prevail.
145	Only structural-design vetting fees (by IIT/IISc) are explicitly stated to be "reimbursed on actuals"; no mention of other reimbursables.	[Commercial] Please confirm whether reimbursable expenses (travel, stay, printing/plotting, physical model-making, renders/animations, courier) are to be included within the quoted percentage fee, or billed separately on actuals as with the structural-vetting fee.	This information has no significance at EoI stage. Price bid is part of RfP.
146	Cl 4.2.6, p.34	[Legal] Please confirm that the Consultant's BOQ/quantity estimates are indicative professional assessments, and that the Consultant is not commercially liable for quantity variations arising during actual execution/EPC tendering.	Will be clarified at RfP stage.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
147	9. Meet all agreement and timeline (page 35)	Timelines to be adhered to by both the Design Consultant and Timely approval by the Institute. These need to be determined at the start of the project.	EoI Conditions prevail.
148	Page 35 (Cl. 4.3.1 - Construction Period)	Kindly indicate the anticipated construction period for Phase-I considering the requirement for deployment of a full-time Architect at site.	Will be provided at RfP stage.
149	4.3 Association during Construction 1. (page 35)	We can provide a site representative for the construction stage, terms to be agreed. All design decisions are from our Mumbai office.	EoI Conditions prevail.
150	Page 35 (As-Built Drawings Scope)	Kindly confirm that the EPC/Executing Agency shall prepare the as-built drawings/models based on actual execution, with the consultant responsible for their review and coordination.	"as-built" architectural drawings shall be prepared by the appointed Architect. The Contractor shall prepare the "as-built" MEP drawings which shall be reviewed by the appointed Architect.
151	4.3 Association during Construction 4. (page 35)	As built drawings are prepared by the EPC Contractor and issued to Design Consultant for review and approval. Please confirm.	"as-built" architectural drawings shall be prepared by the appointed Architect. The Contractor shall prepare the "as-built" MEP drawings which shall be reviewed by the appointed Architect.
152	Construction-Stage Association / As-Built Drawings — Clause 4.3, Page 35	As-built drawings are generally prepared by the EPC/Construction Contractor based on the actual works executed at site. Kindly clarify whether the Contractor shall be responsible for preparation and submission of the as-built drawings, while the Consultant's responsibility shall be limited to review, verification and certification/approval of the same for conformity with the approved design and actual site conditions.	"as-built" architectural drawings shall be prepared by the appointed Architect. The Contractor shall prepare the "as-built" MEP drawings which shall be reviewed by the appointed Architect.
153	ToR addresses the Consultant's review of shop drawings/material submittals during construction (Cl 4.3.5), but not review of EPC contractor bid/tender submissions at the tendering stage.	[Technical] Please confirm whether technical checking/validation of EPC contractor bid submissions (at the tendering stage) falls within the Consultant's scope, or is to be undertaken by the Institute's PMC/technical evaluation committee.	Details will be given in the RfP document

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
154	Cl 4.3.6, p.35	[Commercial] Please confirm whether any post-handover/retainer architect period (distinct from the Phase-II extension contemplated at Cl 4.3.6) is envisaged, and if so, request that it be defined as a separate scope of services under a separate work order and fee rate rather than continuing at the original design-stage fee rate.	EoI Conditions prevail.
155	General Clause (RFP Missing Clauses)	We would like to mention here that, the RFP is missing out many contractual Clauses which are necessary in the interest of both the parties. We are mentioning few clauses to incorporate in RFP: Liability- Maximum upto one time of contract value; Force Majeure; Indemnification.	Contractual clauses such as Liability caps, Force Majeure and Indemnification are not part of this EoI and, as per Cl. 5, would be matters for the RFP/contract stage
156	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Clarify liquidated damages clause applicability, confirm whether it is intended for contractors/EPC packages and not design consultants, or request modification. (Note: as this EoI does not include a draft Agreement/GCC, we request that this point be addressed when the draft consultancy agreement is issued with the RfP; flagging now for early attention.)	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
157	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Commercial] Request that Bank Guarantee requirements against advance payment (typically an EPC/contractor provision) be waived or modified for design consultancy engagements.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
158	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that termination and liability clauses be limited to proven negligence in consultancy performance and capped in line with industry-standard consultancy agreements, rather than construction-contract-style risk-and-cost recovery.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
159	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Clarify insurance requirements - confirm whether an umbrella Professional Indemnity policy is acceptable, or whether project-specific cover is required (and on what reimbursement basis).	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
160	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that the Professional Indemnity insurance requirement be capped in line with, and not exceeding, the agreed contractual liability cap, with no obligation to procure cover in excess of that cap.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
161	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Commercial] Confirm whether 'no escalation' clauses on fees apply for the full term including extensions, and request a mechanism for fee revision on client-caused delays.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
162	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that reuse rights to generic design methodologies, templates, and non-project-specific intellectual property developed by the Consultant remain with the Consultant, distinct from project-specific deliverables assigned to the Client.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
163	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Commercial] Request a defined mechanism for the commercial treatment of design changes based on origin, client-driven, statutory-driven, or contractor-driven - so that time and cost implications are clearly attributable.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
164	The Eol contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36). Note: Eol Section III Cl 7.0 does specify a Bid Security of Rs 1,00,000 at Eol stage, and a Performance Security of 5% of Contract Value is stated for the successful bidder at RfP/award stage (Cl 8.0, p.21) – a further Security Deposit is not separately mentioned.	[Commercial] Confirm whether a Security Deposit is required in addition to / in lieu of a Bank Guarantee, and if so, request its value and release conditions be aligned with standard consultancy norms.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
165	The Eol contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36). No advance-payment provision is mentioned in the Eol.	[Commercial] Confirm the advance payment amount linked to the Bank Guarantee, and clarify whether the advance can be released without BG linkage or against a lower-value instrument.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
166	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Commercial] Where an invoice dispute-notice period and a separate payment timeline are both specified, confirm whether the dispute period runs within or in addition to the payment timeline, and request that any undisputed portion of an invoice be payable within the agreed timeline regardless of a dispute on the balance.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
167	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that Defect Liability Period (DLP) obligations, being typically applicable to contractors, be waived or appropriately limited for Design Consultants.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
168	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Where the RFP requires acknowledgment of reliance on Client-provided information with a blanket 'no claim whatsoever' waiver, request a carve-out preserving the right to raise claims arising from misrepresentation, incomplete disclosure, or scope changes attributable to the Client.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
169	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that any provision granting the Client a unilateral right to renegotiate the fee or terms of the agreement be revised to require mutual written consent of both parties for any such change.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
170	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that representations, warranties, and covenants under the contract be made mutual and reciprocal between the Consultant and the Client, rather than one-sided.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
171	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request a defined turnaround time (e.g., 15 business days) for Client approval of sub-consultants/sub-contractors, with approval deemed granted if no response is received, and confirmation that approval will not be unreasonably withheld.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
172	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that indemnity obligations for sub-consultant claims be limited to claims arising from the Consultant's proven breach or negligence, with an express carve-out for claims arising from the Client's own acts, omissions, or direct instructions.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
173	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request a minimum notice period (e.g., 7-10 working days) before the Client exercises any set-off, deduction, or recovery against sums payable to the Consultant.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
174	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Confirm that the contract's dispute resolution mechanism applies to all categories of disputes, including commercial and invoice disputes, and not only technical matters.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
175	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Legal] Request that the Consultant have a reciprocal right to terminate the agreement in the event of the Client's non-payment or non-compliance with agreed terms, with entitlement to payment for work performed and reasonable demobilization costs.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
176	The EoI contains no draft General Conditions of Contract / Consultancy Agreement; contractual terms (liability, indemnity, insurance, termination, IP, BG, escalation etc.) are not covered in this document and are expected to be issued with the RfP (Cl 5, Section V, p.36).	[Commercial] Request that any continued services, defect rectification, or knowledge transfer required after termination be compensated at agreed rates rather than provided at no cost.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
177	No overall project tenure/timeline is stated; explicitly deferred – "detailed ToR, delivery schedule/timelines... may be refined in the RFP."	[Technical] Please share the anticipated overall project tenure – expected duration for Master Planning, Design Development, GFC/tendering support, and construction-stage association – across Phase-I and the Phase-II extension.	Details will be given in the RfP document
178	Not specified in EoI	[Legal] Please confirm whether a penalty/liquidated-damages clause will apply to the Design Consultant's engagement, and if so, share the draft clause (basis, cap as % of fee, and events of default it attaches to) at RfP stage for review – recognising that liquidated-damages provisions are typically intended for EPC/construction contractors rather than design consultants.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.

Sl.No.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
179	General Clause (Contractual Terms)	Bidder submits that the RFP is missing several contractual clauses necessary in the interest of both parties, and requests that the following be incorporated: (i) Liability — capped at maximum one time of contract value; (ii) Force Majeure; (iii) Indemnification.	Please refer to Sl. No. 155.
180	Appendix-4 — Milestones for Release of Fee	Requested that the fee release schedule be front-loaded, i.e. a higher percentage be released at the design/pre-construction stages (MM-1 to MM-4) and a correspondingly lower percentage tied to the construction-stage milestone (MM-5), as per the following bidder-proposed revision: MM-1: Master Planning, Architectural Design (Preliminary) & DBRs: existing 15% -> proposed 20%; MM-2: Detailed Architectural Design, Pre-Structural Design, BIM (LOD 300) & Preliminary Estimate: existing 20% -> proposed 25%; MM-3: EPC Tender Support: existing 5% -> proposed 10%; MM-4.1: Vetting of detailed architectural design & GFC drawings: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-4.2: Vetting of structural design & drawings: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-4.3: Vetting of Electrical, HVAC, Plumbing/PHED & Fire & Life Safety: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-4.4: Vetting of ICT/ELV, security, lifts, sustainability, external development: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-4.5: Vetting of coordinated GFC/BIM drawings & shop drawings: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-4.6: Vetting of As-Built Drawings incl. 1-yr GRIHA audit support: existing 5% -> proposed 5%; MM-5: Commensurate with payment to EPC Contractor (RA bills): existing 30% -> proposed 15%. (Net effect: cumulative fee released by end of MM-4.6 increased from 70% to 85%, with MM-5 reduced from 30% to 15%.)	EoI Conditions prevail.
181	Form 1.2 (Blacklist Declaration), Page No. 40	Submitted an understanding that the blacklisting/debarment requirement should be based on the current status as on the bid submission date, as generally followed by most Govt. / PSUs. Requested that the clause be revised to "currently not blacklisted/debarred" instead of the last three years.	EoI Conditions prevail.

Sl.N o.	Reference Clause / Page No.	Query Description	Response of IIT Goa
182	Page 44 (Average Annual Turnover)	For the year 2025-2026 our audit is under process; we will only be able to provide unaudited total revenue for this year 2025-2026. Alternatively, we would request you to allow us to produce the data from 2017-18 up to 2024-25.	Please refer to the Note at page 44. For FY 2025-26, financial information and ITRs: Audited financial statements for FY 2025-26, or provisional financial statements certified by the statutory auditor/CA can be submitted where the statutory audit/return filing is not yet due or completed will be considered.
183	General	PMC scope is excluded from our scope,	Project Management Consultancy services are not part of the scope of the Appointed Architect.
184	General — Relaxation of EoI Criteria	Submitted that, since this is only the EoI stage and the top-6 bidders will subsequently be shortlisted for the RFP stage, the restrictive criteria be relaxed at this stage to provide a fair opportunity to capable and experienced firms and encourage wider participation.	Please refer to Corrigendum for revised eligibility criteria
185	Section IV, Criteria 1 / Marking Matrix 1.2 & 1.3, Pages 23–25	The bidder has completed several large-scale institutional, governmental, educational, hospitality and mixed-use campus projects, some executed in multiple phases, <i>which individually may not meet the prescribed built-up area or master-planning-area threshold</i> but which, taken together, demonstrate capability in handling complex, multi-disciplinary institutional and campus-scale developments similar in nature to the proposed project. Requested that IIT Goa kindly consider whether such projects, particularly where development has been executed in multiple phases, may be considered for eligibility assessment.	EoI Conditions prevail.
186	Section IV, Criteria 2 (Financial Capability), Page 24	The bidder's financial credentials (average annual turnover over the last five years, and net worth) are below the prescribed thresholds. Submitted that, despite not meeting the prescribed financial threshold, the firm possesses extensive professional expertise, a strong track record of successful project delivery, and substantial experience in architectural and master planning consultancy. Since Joint Ventures are not permitted under the EoI, requested consideration for relaxation/exemption of the financial eligibility requirements, or confirmation whether firms with demonstrated technical competence and relevant experience may still be considered under the EoI process.	EoI Conditions prevail.