



## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR HIRING OF TRANSACTION ADVISORS FOR SWO ASSET OPTIMIZATION AND PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE**

### **RESPONSES TO QUERIES DOCUMENT**

#### **IMPORTANT NOTICE / DISCLAIMER**

This Response to Queries Document (this **Response Document**) is further to the Request for Proposal (consisting of the Request for Proposal and Draft Consultancy Agreement issued on **28<sup>th</sup> February, 2025**) (the **RFP Documents**) in respect of the bidding process relating to hiring a consultancy firm / consortium for Transaction Advisory Services for SWO Asset Optimization and Partnership Initiative (the **Project**).

This Response Document is being circulated by the Staff Welfare Organization (SWO), solely for use by the recipients in preparing and submitting their Bids for participation in the competitive bidding process in relation to the Project. Upon signing of the Consultancy Agreement for the Project, the Consultancy Agreement will be the final and binding document and any responses set out in this Response Document will not have any effect or be sued for interpretation.

This Response Document is not an agreement; its sole purpose is to provide interested parties with information that may be useful to them in making their offers (bids/proposals) pursuant to the RFP Documents. Neither the SWO nor its employees, personnel, agents, consultants, advisors and contractors etc., shall have any liability for this Response Document or for any other written or oral communication transmitted to the recipient in the course of the recipient's evaluation of the Project. Neither these entities nor their employees, personnel, agents, consultants, advisors and contractors etc., will be liable in any manner whatsoever to reimburse or compensate the recipient for any costs, fees, damages or expenses incurred by the recipient in evaluating or acting upon this Response Document or otherwise in connection with the Project. SWO expressly disavow any obligation or duty (whether in contract, tort or otherwise) to any Bidder.

## Responses on Queries of Consultants

Following are the answers / clarifications to the questions / queries raised by the interested / potential bidders during the pre-bid meeting held on Friday, 07<sup>th</sup> March 2025, and subsequently through email(s), in respect of the Request of Proposals issued by SWO in relation to the captioned project.

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
1.	Section 2.27 – Schedule of Deliverables (Page 19): The provided breakdown of payments does not allocate any payment against the Inception Report. While we understand that mobilization advances are generally not encouraged for service-based contracts, the Inception Report represents a tangible milestone, including a concise methodology, finalized timelines, and strategic direction. Given that the assignment requires nationwide visits to SWO assets, which will entail substantial effort, we suggest allocating at least 10% of the total fee to the Inception Report without altering the overall fee allocation under Phase 01.	Please see the revised Section 2.27 – Schedule of Deliverables at <b>Annexure-A</b> .
2.	<b>Success Fee Consideration:</b> The current deliverables and payment structure do not include a success fee provision for the Transaction Advisor. Considering that bids will be submitted in a competitive environment, would the client be open to incorporating a success fee—set at an agreed percentage (with a ceiling)—to serve as an incentive for the successful bidder?	<p>Language of the query is unclear. However, based on the verbal discussion held during the pre-bid meeting, it is comprehended that the inquiry pertains to the inclusion of a success fee i.e. a certain percentage of the total fee linked to the successful closure of the project.</p> <p>Please note that the services of transaction advisors are required until financial closure, which includes the successful execution of project agreements. This aspect is already covered under Section 2.27 of the RFP, which allocates 20% of the total fee as a success fee tied to commercial and financial closure. Bidders/consultants are required to structure their financial proposals strictly in accordance with Section 2.27 of the RFP.</p> <p>Please note that no additional fee structures beyond what is specified in the RFP will be accepted. Furthermore, for this assignment, there will be no direct payment to the consultants by the selected private party for the project.</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
3.	<b>Section 5 – Terms of Reference (Pages 36-37):</b> The scope of work suggests that the assessment of earmarked assets will lead to the development of a comprehensive modernization plan for SWO’s assets. However, the existing use of these assets may not present an attractive proposition for prospective investors. Would the client consider exploring alternative utilization models for these assets to enhance their attractiveness while ensuring favorable outcomes for SWO?	Consultants are advised to attentively study the RFP, with particular attention to the objectives of SWO’s initiative outlined in Section 1 and the Terms of Reference detailed in Section 5. Based on the feasibility study, the selected transaction advisors will be responsible for recommending optimized utilization models that best align with the government's objectives.
4.	<b>Section 6.2 – Scoring System (Page 41):</b> The evaluation criteria require submission of assignment completion certificates for claimed projects. While we understand that this requirement is intended to validate a bidder’s service delivery capabilities, public sector clients often do not issue completion certificates. We suggest that project claims also be considered if the bidder can substantiate them through supporting documentation such as the contract title and relevant deliverables.	<p>For projects listed in the proposal where the consultants have provided services to a public sector client, the most preferred and ideal supporting document is a Completion Certificate. Alternatively, the respective score may be awarded if the consultant submits the (i) Title pages of the relevant consultancy agreement; and (ii) Title pages of the relevant deliverable(s).</p> <p>Please note that the Procuring Agency reserves the right to contact the respective public sector client for verification. In case of any misrepresentation or false claims regarding experience, the Consortium may be disqualified, and all of its members may be considered for blacklisting by the Procuring Agency.</p>
5.	<b>Technical Member Expertise Evaluation:</b> Could you please clarify how the experience of a technical expert in environmental assessment and environmental management will be evaluated? Specifically, will this be assessed based on (i) the firm’s years of operation, or (ii) relevant project experience within a specific timeframe?	The criteria and scoring are self-explanatory. Points will be awarded based on the number of years of experience the technical/engineering firm has in environmental consultancy. The consulting firm must include in its Proposal the date of its formation and a list of projects or assignments for which it has provided environmental consultancy services since its inception.
6.	<b>Experience Criteria for Legal Experts:</b> In evaluating experience for (i) the development of bidding packages and (ii) the signing of concession agreements, will the client consider the experience of an individual Legal Expert under these categories, or will only the firm’s experience be evaluated? This query is based on the premise that, in many instances, legal experts are engaged through individual contractual arrangements rather than as part of a firm’s permanent staff. Additionally, we note that local public procuring agencies typically allow individual expert experience to be considered—specifically in the case of legal firms. Would the client adopt a similar approach for this procurement?	Consultants are advised to attentively study the RFP. Under Section 6B – Scoring System, there are distinct categories for evaluation. The first category pertains to the experience of the firm, and for assessing experience in the development of bidding packages, only the firm's experience will be considered. The credentials of individual experts will be evaluated separately under the second category i.e. Key Professional Staff.

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
7.	<b>Extension of Bid Submission Deadline:</b> Given the reduced working hours, we request an extension of the bid submission deadline by two (02) weeks to ensure a well-prepared and comprehensive bid response.	The bid submission deadline has been extended to <b>14<sup>th</sup> April 2025</b> . Time of the submission and opening of bids remains the same.
8.	In Section 2.1: Definitions, it specifies that the lead member of a consortium will be the financial consultancy firm. However, in Section 6.2: Scoring System, the financial member's experience in financial advisory services is allocated only 5 marks, while the technical member can earn up to 18 marks. It is therefore recommended that the language maybe amended to allow any member of the consortium to be a lead member.	<p>As explained during the pre-bid meeting, the scoring system has been designed to ensure an equitable and balanced evaluation across the required consulting team. The financial advisory firm has been designated as the Lead Member of the Consortium for the following key reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Strong project coordination capabilities: Financial advisory firms are typically more structured and proactive in managing multi-stakeholder engagements.</li> <li>b. Enhanced presentation and reporting skills: Their ability to articulate findings, develop financial models and structure investment cases makes them better suited to lead.</li> <li>c. Active role throughout the project lifecycle: Unlike legal and technical consultants, whose involvement is more intermittent depending on project milestones, financial advisors remain consistently engaged in structuring, bidding and transaction closure.</li> <li>d. Better alignment with investor engagement: Financial advisory firms have direct access to potential investors, lenders and funding sources, enabling them to optimize project financing strategies.</li> </ul> <p>Given these factors, the selection of a financial advisory firm as the Lead Member ensures greater efficiency, market responsiveness and seamless execution of the project.</p>
9.	In Section 6.2: Scoring System, it mentions that experience in transaction advisory for completed PPP projects is required only up to the signing of the concession agreement. Given that the project requirements also encompass achieving financial close, it would be more suitable to consider completed assignments up to the point of financial close instead of limiting it to just the signing of the concession agreement.	Please see the revised table of first section 'Firm's relevant Experience' of 6B – Scoring System at <b>Annexure-B</b> .

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	It is therefore proposed that the completed PPP projects requirement may be amended to include financial close as milestone.	
10.	In Section 6.2: Scoring System, it states that experience in transaction advisory for completed PPP projects is required up to the signing of the concession agreement by either the financial or legal member of the consortium. As proposed in query 1 above, this requirement may also be attributed to the lead member.	Please refer to response to the query no. 9.
11.	According to Section 2.27: Schedule of Deliverables, the Transaction Advisor will not receive any payment until the submission of the technical feasibility study, financial viability assessment report, PPP option analysis report, and legal & regulatory assessment report. However, Section 5.3 states that the technical member of the consortium is required to conduct a detailed assessment of the current state of assets, including topographic surveys, soil investigations, and geotechnical investigations for all sites, to certify that the available land or developed structures are suitable for use. Given that the technical member will incur significant expenses during this process, it is proposed to allocate at least 10% of the payment upon submission of the inception report.	Please refer to response to the query no. 1.
12.	In accordance with Section 2.27: Schedule of Deliverables, 15% of the total payment is contingent upon the achievement of financial close. This implies that, regardless of the circumstances that may prevent achieving financial close, the Transaction Advisor will not receive this payment. Therefore, it is recommended to link 15% of the total payment to the transaction negotiation and signing of the concession agreement, while allocating 5% to the achievement of financial close.	Not accepted.  Please refer to response to the query no. 1.
13.	In order to attract leading transaction advisory firms with required expertise to enhance the overall quality of the feasibility study and boost the confidence of potential bidders, it is proposed that the financial capability requirement should be at least PKR 500 million (generally in line with the industry practice and particularly as per another active RFP launched by P3A).	The requirement for a substantial revenue base is not a primary criterion for the selection of consultants. Therefore, to encourage broader participation and foster a competitive bidding environment, the criteria have been deliberately set at a relaxed and lower threshold.  Not accepted.
14.	Based on our high-level understanding, we anticipate that there may be multiple procurements (RFPs and Concession Agreements) related to this project. In this regard, you are requested to please clarify the following:	It is affirmed that the nature and commercial dynamics of the assets/properties vary, and the concern regarding the potential exclusion of certain assets from the PPP initiative or the possibility

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the Transaction Advisor identifies/proposes less than the 45 available assets are viable and recommends excluding certain ones from the transaction, will this affect the overall price quoted by the Transaction Advisor?</li> <li>b. The current payment deliverable structure is not capturing a scenario where there might be more than one procurement package for those assets.</li> <li>c. How should we approach pricing in this scenario?</li> </ul>	<p>of multiple PPP procurements/contracts is valid. Below are the responses to the specific points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Since the technical feasibility study (including surveys, market research, etc.) is largely a volumetric exercise, the exclusion of certain assets from the final PPP transaction will not impact the amount of services notably and the overall transaction advisory fee will not be affected.</li> <li>b. Similarly, as all subsequent stages beyond the feasibility study do not require entirely separate or distinctive work, the transaction advisory fee will remain unchanged even if multiple PPP procurements are undertaken instead of a single procurement.</li> <li>c. The responses provided in points A and B comprehensively address this concern. Given the small scale of the assets/properties, it appears most optimal to bundle them into a single PPP project. Consultants should anticipate a single procurement process and determine their pricing accordingly.</li> </ul>
15.	<p>We are considering the formation of an experienced and robust consortium to undertake this assignment. Additionally, with the ongoing holy month of Ramadan followed by the Eid holidays, we believe that extending the submission deadline would encourage better participation from the potential bidders. Therefore, we propose to extend the deadline by two weeks after the Eid holidays, setting it to 14 April 2025.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to the query no. 7.</p>
16.	<p><b>Qualifications and Competence of Key Staff – Legal Team Leader &amp; Legal Expert (Page 45)</b></p> <p>For the key positions of Legal Team Leader and Legal Expert, the legal key members must demonstrate experience in drafting procurement documents, such as RFPs and Concession/PPP Agreements, and provide evidence of experience in transaction advisory services up to financial close for infrastructure projects. While experience in drafting procurement documents is commonly required for similar assignments, the requirement for transaction advisory experience up to financial close is unprecedented and highly uncommon.</p>	<p>The requirement for experience up to financial closure has been introduced primarily to evaluate the core experience of the expert in successfully closing transactions, rather than solely awarding scores based on the number of years of experience.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the primary role of legal and financial experts in a PPP transaction (advising a public sector client) is typically required up to commercial closure. However, the required experience of individual experts is not limited to advisory services</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<p>Moreover, in assignments where only transaction advisory experience is required, legal experts have consistently been expected to demonstrate experience up to the signing of the concession agreement. It is unclear why legal experts are now required to demonstrate experience up to financial close.</p> <p>Furthermore, the legal expert/firm is already required to demonstrate transaction advisory experience (up to the signing of the concession agreement) under Form 2B. Successfully furnishing experience under this category establishes that the legal expert/firm has sufficient expertise in transaction advisory services. However, under the CVs of legal experts, additional experience in transaction advisory up to financial close is also required. Since Form 2B already substantiates that the legal expert possesses the relevant experience, experience up to financial close in the CVs of the legal experts appear unwarranted.</p> <p>Reference is also made to the pre-bid meeting, where it was discussed that most PPP projects do not achieve financial close due to various factors, such as lack of financing and government-related issues.</p> <p>While PPP projects often reach commercial close, financial close is rarely achieved in PPP projects.</p> <p>In light of the foregoing, it is requested that the experience requirements for the key positions of Legal Team Leader and Legal Expert be revisited and limited to experience in drafting procurement documents, such as RFPs and Concession Agreements.</p>	<p>for PPP projects alone. It may also include (i) Advisory services for private sector project finance transactions; or (ii) Advisory services for private sector clients in PPP projects.</p> <p>The revised criteria and scoring for the Financial and Legal Teams are attached as <b>Annexure-C</b> for reference.</p>
17.	<p><b>Qualifications and Competence of Key Staff – Page 43</b></p> <p>Under the key staff requirement, legal team members are required to demonstrate experience in transaction advisory for infrastructure projects of a minimum size of PKR 5 billion, whereas for the financial team, the requirement is PKR 3 billion. It must be noted that financial experts play a more direct role in assisting the client in achieving financial close such as finalizing the terms and conditions of financing, reviewing the term sheet, financing documents, while the legal team primarily assists the financial expert and provide legal input where required. Considering the aforementioned, when legal experts are not directly involved and play a supporting role in this area, it is unclear why a higher financial threshold has been set for the legal team.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to the query no. 16.</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	In light of the above, it is requested that this criteria be revisited.	
18.	<p>Section 2.26.1(v) of the RFP requires, in case of a consortium, the consortium agreement to contain “An undertaking that the firms are jointly and severally liable to the Authority for the performance of the services”. It is important to note that the reproduced term is not practically viable, and the consortium members should be liable for their own tasks as per the terms of references outlined in the RFP (the ToRs). In event of failure by a consortium member to comply with their respective ToRs, it would be unfair to hold the other members of the consortium liable. Please note that this has been the case for other projects as well in which the firms have been severally liable to the procuring agency for the performance of the services.</p> <p>Therefore, it is suggested to SWO to exclude this requirement and to limit the liability of each member of a consortium to their respective tasks according to the ToRs.</p>	<p>SWO requires the consortium members to be jointly and severally liable to ensure comprehensive accountability and effective coordination through a lead member. This structure is essential for maintaining a streamlined communication channel and managing the overall performance of the consortium as a unified entity. The lead firm acts as the focal point, taking responsibility for coordination and ensuring that the consortium delivers on its commitments.</p> <p>However, we understand the concern regarding individual responsibilities. In normal circumstances, the joint liability is primarily for coordination purposes, with each member expected to fulfill their respective tasks as per the terms of reference (ToRs). The provision of several liability is invoked only in extreme or unforeseen situations or in cases of non-performance by any consortium member. This ensures that the overall project is not compromised due to the failure of any single member, thereby safeguarding the interests of the project and the Authority.</p> <p>This approach strikes a balance between individual accountability and collective responsibility, ensuring the smooth execution of the project.</p>
19.	Section 2.26.2 of the RFP mentions, inter alia, that the lead member shall be responsible for receiving payments for and on behalf of the consortium. It is requested that the procuring agency make payment to each consortium member individually after receiving a request for payment by the lead member for on behalf of the entire consortium. It is worth noting that in the past, procuring agencies have acknowledged this as a valid approach to prevent double taxation.	Please refer to Section 2.2(f) of the draft consultancy agreement attached to the RFP. It already addresses your concern.



No.	Query / Clarification	Response
20.	<p>Section 2.7.2 of the RFP stipulates that the procurement would take place through “EPADS”. While we appreciate SWO’s initiative in modernizing its procurement process, we seek clarification on why the RFP still requires the submission of physical bids.</p>	<p>While EPADS is an efficient platform for online bid submission, SWO has recommended the submission of hard copies for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ease of Reference &amp; Evaluation: Hard copies allow the evaluation committee to review documents efficiently during meetings and discussions without relying solely on digital screens.</li> <li>b. Backup &amp; Redundancy: In case of any technical issues, data corruption, or system downtime, having a hard copy ensures that bid documents remain accessible.</li> <li>c. Official Record Keeping: Physical records are often required for compliance and audit purposes, as part of standard government procurement documentation.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that submission of hard copies is recommended. Bidders are encouraged to comply to facilitate smooth processing of their proposals.</p>
21.	<p>Qualification requirement/ criteria for 'Technical Team Lead' may also have provision for 'Degree in Civil Engineering' as acceptable under section 6.2 Scoring System (TECHNICAL TEAM).</p> <p>We would appreciate if this query can be considered.</p>	<p>To broaden the pool of qualified bidders and ensure a more competitive selection process, the criteria is modified. The revised qualification requirement is:</p> <p><b>Qualification:</b> Degree in Hospitality Management, Business Administration, Civil Engineering, or Project Management</p>

## Annexure – A

### 2.27 Schedule of Deliverables

	Phase-1: Feasibility Study	Timeline	Payment
1	Inception Report (shall cover 5.3.1.1 of TORs)	Two Weeks	05%
2	Technical Feasibility Study (shall cover 5.3.1.2 of TORs)	4 months	30%
3	Financial Viability Assessment Report & PPP Options Analysis Report (shall cover 5.3.1.3 and 5.3.1.4 of TORs)	4 months	05%
4	Legal, Institutional and Regulatory Assessment Report (shall cover 5.3.1.5 of TORs)	4 months	05%
			<b>45%</b>

	Phase-2: Transaction Advisory	Timeline	Payment
5	Preparation and Submission of Procurement Package (shall cover 5.3.2.1 of TORs)	5 Months	20%
6	Issuance of Bid Documents and Market Sounding (shall cover 5.3.2.2 and 5.3.2.3 of ToRs)	6 Months	05%
7	Submission of Bid Evaluation Report (shall cover 5.3.2.4 of ToRs)	9 Months	05%
8	Issuance of Letter of Award/Acceptance (shall cover 5.3.2.5 of ToRs)	10 Months	05%
			<b>35%</b>

	Phase-3: Transaction Negotiation and Financial Closure	Timeline	Payment
7	Transaction Negotiation & Signing of Concession Agreement (shall cover 5.3.3.1 of ToRs)	11 months	5%
8	Execution of ancillary agreements and other required documents (shall cover 5.3.3.2 of ToRs)	12 months	10%
9	Financial Close (shall cover 5.3.3.3. of ToRs)	15 Months	5%
			<b>20%</b>

\* The timeline is from signing of Consultancy Services Agreement for each deliverable

**Note:** Please note that '4.2 FORM FIN-2 SUMMARY OF COSTS' will also be revised in line with the percentage of fees mentioned in the updated Schedule of Deliverables.

## Annexure – B

### 6B – Scoring System

Criteria		Mark
<b>1. Firm's relevant Experience</b>  <b>Note:</b> <i>(i) Scores will be awarded to a Bidder based on milestones achieved or work completed for a project</i> <i>(ii) In case of the Consortium, scores will be allotted only once for the same project / milestone</i> <i>(iii) Bidders shall attach supporting document / evidence of experience validating completion of work</i> <i>(iv) Experience of Advisors will only be considered for public sector projects / clients (except where relaxation is stated)</i> <i>(v) Historical exchange rate prevailing on completion of milestone will be used to convert foreign currency to PKR</i>	Experience of feasibility study during last 10 years of projects pertaining to hospitality or real estate development (of minimum size of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent) by technical member of the Consortium	15
	For this criterion, private sector projects with satisfactory evidence (like client satisfaction letter of completion on its letter head) regarding completion of work will also be considered. Private sector projects will be awarded 50% marks.	
	03 or more Projects15 marks	
	02 Projects10 marks	
	01 Project05 marks	
	Experience of financial advisory services during the last 10 years of a project pertaining to the development of real estate development or hospitality infrastructure (of a minimum size of cost Rs. 5 billion or equivalent) by financial member of the Consortium.	05
	For this criterion, private sector projects with satisfactory evidence (like client satisfaction letter of completion on its letter head) regarding completion of work will also be considered. Private sector projects will be awarded 50% marks.	
	02 or more Projects05 marks	
	01 Project03 marks	
	Experience of technical member of the Consortium in providing consulting services in the area of environmental assessment and / or environmental management	03
	10 years or more03 marks	
	7.5 years to less than 10 years02 marks	
	5 years to less than 7.5 years01 mark	
	Experience of development of bidding package during last 10 years (including RFQ/RFP and draft concession agreement, etc.) of a PPP project of minimum size of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent, by legal member of Consortium	08
	03 or more Projects08 marks	
02 Projects06 marks		
01 Project03 marks		
	Experience of transaction advisory of completed PPP project (up to signing of concession agreement) of minimum size of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent by financial / legal member of the Consortium during last 10 years	07
	03 or more Projects07 marks	
	02 Projects05 marks	
	01 Project03 marks	

	Experience of transaction advisory of completed PPP project (up to financial closure / signing of loan agreement) of minimum size of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent by financial member of the Consortium during last 10 years	07
	03 or more Projects                      07 marks 02 Projects                                  05 marks 01 Project                                    03 marks	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>45</b>

## Annexure – C

### Scoring of Financial Team and Legal Team

#	FINANCIAL TEAM	Weightage																
1.	Financial Team Leader	<p><u>Qualification:</u> CA/CFA/ICMA/ACCA/MBA (25%) Bachelors in Finance/Accounting/Business Administration (15%)</p> <p><u>Relevant Experience</u> Experience of infrastructure transaction advisory</p> <table><tr><td>More than 10 years</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>7 years to less than 10 years</td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>5 years to less than 7 years</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Less than 5 years</td><td>0%</td></tr></table> <p>Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to financial closure) for infrastructure projects of minimum size of Rs. 3 billion</p> <table><tr><td>More than 4 projects</td><td>35%</td></tr><tr><td>3 to 4 projects</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>2 projects</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Less than 2 projects</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	More than 10 years	40%	7 years to less than 10 years	30%	5 years to less than 7 years	20%	Less than 5 years	0%	More than 4 projects	35%	3 to 4 projects	25%	2 projects	15%	Less than 2 projects	0%
More than 10 years	40%																	
7 years to less than 10 years	30%																	
5 years to less than 7 years	20%																	
Less than 5 years	0%																	
More than 4 projects	35%																	
3 to 4 projects	25%																	
2 projects	15%																	
Less than 2 projects	0%																	
2.	Project Finance Specialist	<p><u>Qualification:</u> CA/CFA/ICMA/ACCA/MBA (25%) Bachelors in Finance/Accounting/Business Admin (15%)</p> <p><u>Relevant Experience</u> Experience of developing financial models/financial structuring of infrastructure projects</p> <table><tr><td>More than 7 years</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>5 years to less than 7 years</td><td>30%</td></tr><tr><td>3 years to less than 5 years</td><td>20%</td></tr><tr><td>Less than 3 years</td><td>0%</td></tr></table> <p>Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to financial closure) for infrastructure projects of minimum size of Rs. 3 billion</p> <table><tr><td>More than 2 projects</td><td>35%</td></tr><tr><td>Up to 2 projects</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>Less than 2 projects</td><td>0%</td></tr></table>	More than 7 years	40%	5 years to less than 7 years	30%	3 years to less than 5 years	20%	Less than 3 years	0%	More than 2 projects	35%	Up to 2 projects	25%	Less than 2 projects	0%		
More than 7 years	40%																	
5 years to less than 7 years	30%																	
3 years to less than 5 years	20%																	
Less than 3 years	0%																	
More than 2 projects	35%																	
Up to 2 projects	25%																	
Less than 2 projects	0%																	
	Legal Team Leader	<p><u>Qualification:</u> LLB (25%)</p> <p><u>Relevant Experience</u> Experience of drafting procurement documents e.g. (EOIs, RFQ, RFP), Concession/PPP agreements / EPC contracts of infrastructure projects</p>																

		<p>More than 10 years                      40%</p> <p>7 years to less than 10 years       30%</p> <p>5 years to less than 7 years        20%</p> <p>Less than 5 years                      0%</p> <p>Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to commercial / financial closure) for infrastructure projects of minimum size of Rs. 3 billion</p> <p>More than 4 projects                      35%</p> <p>3 to 4 projects                            25%</p> <p>2 projects                                    15%</p> <p>Less than 2 projects                    0%</p>
	Legal Expert	<p><u>Qualification:</u> LLB (25%)</p> <p><u>Relevant Experience</u> Experience of drafting procurement documents e.g. (EOIs, RFQ, RFP), Concession/PPP agreements / EPC contracts of infrastructure projects</p> <p>More than 7 years                      40%</p> <p>5 years to less than 7 years       30%</p> <p>3 years to less than 5 years       20%</p> <p>Less than 3 years                      0%</p> <p>Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to commercial / financial closure) for infrastructure projects of minimum size of Rs. 3 billion</p> <p>More than 2 projects                      35%</p> <p>Up to 2 projects                            25%</p> <p>Less than 2 projects                    0%</p>