

Minutes of Meeting

Date of the meeting	21 st January 2021
Meeting Agenda	Industry Consultation Workshop for HR RFB
Meeting Location	Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Room No. 411, Level 5, East Block 6, R.K. Puram, New Delhi 110066 And on Teams
MOSPI Officials	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mr. M. M. Hasija, ADG, MOSPI2. Ms. R. Savithri, DDG, MOSPI3. Mr. Rajesh Bhatia, DDG MOSPI4. Ms. Neha Srivastava, Director, MOSPI5. Ms. Kiruthika, Deputy Director, MOSPI
Industry Participants	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Mr. Naval from ARCEUS2. Mr. Amit from ARCEUS3. Mr. Sanjay Dhar from Collabera Technologies4. Mr. Ajay from Innov Source5. Mr. Murad from KPMG6. Mr. Amit from Prakhar Software7. Mr. Ashutosh Rai from PwC8. Mr. Dinesh from UDS9. Mr. Satyendra Kumar from BECIL10. Mr. Puneet from Xeam Ventures
PMC Personnel	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Anshul Mittal2. Monolova Mukherjee3. Vivek Verma

Key Meeting Points

RFB for Engagement of HR Firm for supply and management of HR services to MoSPI for undertaking activities of the World Bank assisted Project “National Program for Improving Quality of Statistics in India (NPIQSI)” was floated on 15th June, 2020. However, the bid was cancelled due to Lack of Participation.

An Open Industry Discussion was held on 21st January, 2021 with prospective bidders of the assignment to take their inputs / suggestions towards making the cancelled RFB more lucrative for wider participation before floating the revised RFB. The stakeholders from the industry provided the brief introductions about their organization.

Thereafter, the PMC team made a presentation on the key areas of the previous RFP for HR and steered the discussion to get the feedback and inputs from the industry stakeholders.

The key inputs / suggestions provided by the industry stakeholders are as under:

1. ARCEUS:

- a. The representative from the firm suggested modifying some of the Eligibility and Evaluation criteria to increase the number of participants in the bid. He suggested that for the annual turnover criteria entire turnover of the company should be taken into account as part of technical evaluation so that those IT implementation projects which entailed deployment of large number of resources may also be counted even though manpower deployment was not specifically mentioned as part of work order. He also

- suggested that the turnover criteria should also be reduced to INR 50 Crores.
- b. He requested that IT projects undertaken by the bidders, in which the bidders have provided manpower, should also be considered for the experience criteria of project execution of similar nature and complexity.
 - c. He also requested to dilute the liquid asset criteria as due to the pandemic situation some bidder might have liquidity issues and may not qualify on this criteria. He suggested to replace Liquid asset criteria by criteria of positive net worth of around INR 7 or 8 Crores.
 - d. It was also suggested to add the company certifications such as ISO 9000, 20000, 21000 etc. as qualification criteria.
 - e. He further suggested that the EMD should be reduced to keep it between INR 30 Lacs to 1 Crore as many of the bidders may not be willing to block a large amount in EMD in the current scenario and the PBG should be reduced to 3% of the expected project value.

2. Collabera Technologies:

- a. The representative from the firm requested to provide clarity on value against which PBG shall be calculated i.e. whether it shall be calculated against the full value of project or against commitment for minimum number of resources.
- b. He also suggested to move from service fees model to bill rate model i.e. rather than disclosing the salary of the deployed professional the bidder should be allowed to provide the bill rate of the resource and all other liabilities. A clause may be added that bidder shall share the remuneration details as and when required by MOSPI.
- c. He further suggested that the consortium and/or subcontracting should be allowed for bidding as many of the firms may not have all the competencies required such as providing laptops, internet services, HR Payrolling etc. and for the same they need support from other vendors as well.

3. Innov Source:

- a. The representative from the firm requested for clarification on Scope of Work as below:
 - Whether they would be required to deploy their existing resources or make the new hiring for the project?
 - What would be the salary range for each profile?
 - What would be the expected tender value?
- b. He also suggested that the limitation of liability clause should be modified to cap the liability at the total services fees/cost charged by the bidder for 3 months.

4. KMPG:

- a. The representative from the firm requested for clarification on whether the consortium/ joint ventures etc were allowed as per the clauses of the RFB and for the same, PMC team informed that as mentioned in the RFB, the consortium/joint venture were not allowed and the same was further clarified in the corrigendum.

5. Prakhar Software:

- a. The representative from the firm suggested that the Annual Turnover of INR 100 Crores and minimum strength of 150 for the bidder are not in sync with each other and requested to revisit the clause.
- b. He also mentioned that there are no clauses related to turnover and experience for Start-ups for which it was responded by PMC team that it is world bank funded project

and there are no specific conditions to promote the Start-ups.

6. PwC:

- a. The representative from the firm suggested that the QCBS evaluation method would attract large organizations like them to bid as with the pure L1 evaluation method, it may become difficult for large firms like them, to bid in terms of cost and quality.
- b. He also suggested that approx. 50% of the weightage of technical score should be given to the CVs of the key resources and next preference should be given to the bidder's experience for providing large manpower supply and delivering such complex project.
- c. For evaluation criteria it was suggested to ask for the CVs of at least 15 main resources to be deployed on the project by the bidder.
- d. Since the rates for the resources with the same competency varies over different states/regions of the country, so it is difficult to provide a single cost of resource for all locations and suggested that the rates should be asked state-wise in BoQ.
- e. The clause to disclose the remuneration may be avoided as the remuneration within the team varies and therefore it shall be difficult for the bidders to hire and retain at the same salary. The remuneration details may be provided to the MOSPI on demand to meet their compliances.
- f. He also recommended that the Clause 4.2 of the RFB regarding the conflict of interest is very broad and may be deleted or revisited as the big companies provide various services to multiple government departments and it might be difficult to judge its compliance.
- g. He suggested that the deployment period of the resource should be increased to 90 days from 60 days to get the quality resource as the general notice period for the required resources is 90 days as per industry practices.
- h. It was suggested that bidders should also be accountable for some of the activities, mainly related to quality of deliverables, and related clauses should be incorporated into the RFB.

7. UDS :

- a. The representative of the firm suggested that the CA certificate should also be accepted where there is requirement of Statutory Auditor Certificate as it may become little difficult for some of the bidders to arrange Statutory Auditor Certificate.
- b. He also suggested that the bonuses and other statutory allowance should be directly passed on by MOSPI / or should be reimbursed by MOSPI to bidders
- c. He further suggested that the clause should be added for the bidders that the notice period for 3 months would be provided to the bidders in case the project is kept on hold or suspended as they need to provide the same notice period to the resources as per industry standard.
