

Empanelment of Training Service Providers (TSPs) under GICS Initiative
EOI Reference No.: KSU/GBBOCWB/TSP 2025-26/01

Corrigendum / Amendment

Based on discussions during the Pre-Bid Meeting, the following clarification/modification is issued:

❖ Clause 7.6 – Consortium (Revised)

Existing Provision: Lead Applicant (any eligible entity- industry/company /association /institute/trust/society/Govt./PSU) acting as the Training Service Provider + Mobilization Partner.

Revised Provision (Corrigendum): Lead Applicant any eligible entity – industry/company/ Govt. organization/PSU/industry association/ (institute/trust/society - promoted by industry) acting as the Training Service Provider + Mobilization Partner.

Note: The above clarification is issued to explicitly define the role of the Lead Applicant in both training delivery and mobilization activities. All other provisions of Clause 7.6 remain unchanged.

Clarification / Response by KSU

Sr. No.	Query Raised by Bidder / Clarification Sought	Clarification / Response by KSU
1	The current scoring structure heavily favors very large organizations with turnover exceeding ₹500 Cr. As per the eligibility criteria, the minimum required average turnover is already ₹100 Cr. Therefore, setting a disproportionately high benchmark of ₹500 Cr for maximum marks creates an imbalance between eligibility and scoring. We request you to kindly change the clause as: More than 300Cr: 20 Marks More than 200 Cr - 300 Cr: 15 Marks More than 100 Cr - 200 Cr: 10 Marks	The turnover-based scoring criteria has been designed to ensure participation of financially strong, branded and capable agencies for large-scale implementation of the project. The existing criteria shall remain unchanged.
2	However: The EOI document does not clearly define EMD amount, submission requirement, or detailed forfeiture conditions. We request the Authority to kindly clarify or reconsider the clause regarding forfeiture of EMD upon termination, and specify the conditions under which such forfeiture would be applicable.	As per the EOI document, there is no provision of Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) specified for this EOI. The reference to forfeiture of EMD in Clause 8 appears generic in nature. Since EMD is not applicable in this EOI, the clause shall be interpreted accordingly.
3	Upon detailed review of the EOI, there is: No clear mention of EMD amount, format, or submission process. Please confirm if the bidder need to submit any EMD as part of the bid submission.	No, EMD submission is not required for this EOI. Bidders are advised to comply with all other submission requirements as specified.
4	The EOI specifies submission of audited financial statements for the last three financial years; however, it does not explicitly define the exact financial years to be considered. In practice, audited financials for the most recent financial year (FY 2024-25) are now available with CA certification. Hence, clarity on whether the Authority intends to consider the latest three audited financial years (FY 2022–23, FY 2023–24, FY 2024–25)	The bidder is required to submit audited financial statements for the last three (3) audited financial years available at the time of submission. Accordingly, the latest audited financial years (e.g., FY 2022–23, FY 2023–24, FY 2024–25, if available) shall be considered.
5	We request the Authority to kindly clarify whether consortium participation is permitted. Additionally, it is requested to explicitly allow standalone bidders with group company support, where applicable.	As per Clause 7.6 of the EOI, consortium participation is permitted (maximum two members). Standalone bidders are also allowed. However, group company support is not explicitly recognized unless structured as a consortium with proper documentation (Annexure 4).

6	We request the Authority to kindly consider allowing consolidated turnover of parent company/subsidiaries/group entities, subject to submission of CA certificate and supporting documents. This will enable participation of capable organizations backed by strong group entities.	As per eligibility criteria (Section 7.3), turnover shall be considered for the bidder/lead bidder only. Therefore, consolidated/group turnover shall not be considered.
7	It is requested to allow group company financial strength to be considered for eligibility, with appropriate undertakings and documentary proof.	The eligibility conditions are clearly defined in the EOI. Only the bidder/lead entity's financials will be considered.
8	We request the Authority to kindly clarify whether leased/rented infrastructure and partner centres (through MoU) will be considered valid. Further, we propose allowing submission of infrastructure declaration along with lease agreements/ownership proof.	As per EOI (Trainer & Infrastructure criteria), both owned and leased/rented infrastructure, including centres through valid MoUs, shall be considered acceptable, subject to submission of documentary proof (lease agreement/MoU/ownership documents) and compliance with KSU norms.
9	We request the Authority to kindly revise the evaluation criteria to consider number of projects executed instead of only years, as it better reflects actual execution capability. Suggested: • More than 4 projects – 15 marks • 3–4 projects – 10 marks • 2–3 projects – 5 marks	The current evaluation methodology based on years of experience ensures consistency and standardization across bidders. The criteria shall remain unchanged.
10	We request the Authority to kindly rationalize the turnover marking criteria to enable wider participation. Suggested slabs: • >100 Cr – 20 marks • >75 Cr – 15 marks • >50 Cr – 10 marks	The turnover scoring criteria is aligned with the scale and capacity requirements of the project. Hence, the existing criteria shall remain unchanged.
11	We request the Authority to kindly consider overall candidate training experience (across sectors) instead of restricting only to construction sector, as it reflects organizational capacity. Suggested: • >3000 candidates – 15 marks • >1500 candidates – 10 marks • >1000 candidates – 5 marks	The project is sector-specific (construction) under GICS. Therefore, only construction sector experience shall be considered for evaluation.
12	It is requested to allow CA certificate, work orders, and completion certificates collectively as valid proof of experience to avoid rejection due to document variations.	Bidders may submit relevant supporting documents such as work orders, completion certificates, and CA-certified details, as applicable. However, evaluation will be based on clarity, authenticity, and relevance of submitted documents, as per EOI requirements.
13	Proposed Revised Clause: Average Business Turnover of the bidder in last 03 Financial Years • More than ₹150 Cr: 20 Marks • More than ₹125 Cr – ₹150 Cr: 15 Marks • More than ₹100 Cr – ₹ Cr: 125 Marks Documents Required: 1. Turnover certificate by CA / declaration as per Annexure 3 2. Audited Financial Statements for the last three financial years Justification: Request to revise turnover criteria to allow wider participation of capable bidders. The current thresholds are high and may restrict competition. Also, since ₹100 Cr Minimum turnover is already considered appropriate under eligibility criteria, aligning this clause will ensure consistency and wider participation of competent bidders.	The turnover scoring criteria has been designed considering the scale, financial capability, and implementation capacity required for the project. The existing criteria shall remain unchanged.
14	Proposed Revised Clause: Number of workers trained in Construction Sector related Job Role under NCVET / NSDC / KSU / SSC / Direct Industry in last 05 Financial Years • More than 501 Trained Construction Workers: 15 Marks • 101 – 500 Trained Construction Workers: 10 Marks • 51 – 100 Trained Construction Workers: 5 Marks Documents Required: Copy of Purchase / Work Order / Experience certificate clearly specifying the Scope of Work Justification Request to include training experience delivered directly to industry (non-certified programs) in addition to NCVET/NSDC/KSU/SSC. Restricting to only certified programs excludes significant industry led training experience. Inclusion of direct industry training will ensure fair evaluation of practical experience and wider participation of competent agencies.	As per EOI (Technical Evaluation Criteria), only recognized and verifiable training experience under NCVET/NSDC/KSU/SSC frameworks shall be considered to maintain standardization and quality benchmarks. The existing criteria shall remain unchanged.

15	<p>Proposed Revised Clause: Geographic Presence (Number of Cities) Operational presence in Gujarat through own training centres/offices or group companies' centres / offices, with valid operational proof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • > 5 cities: 20 marks • 3–5 cities: 15 marks • 2–3 cities: 10 marks • 1 city: 5 marks <p>Documents Required: 1. Centre list with addresses and contact details 2. Proof of operations (e.g., affiliation/approval letters, utility bills/lease, AEBAS/attendance extracts), and photos 3. Supporting documents establishing relationship with group companies</p> <p>Justification: We understand the intent of this clause is to ensure adequate geographic presence and operational readiness in Gujarat through the bidder's own training centres /offices active within the preceding 24 months. However, we would like to submit that many established organizations operate through a group of companies' structure, wherein infrastructure, manpower, and operations are distributed across multiple group entities. In such cases, it is not always practical or efficient for a single legal entity to maintain offices across multiple cities, even though the group as a whole possesses strong on-ground presence and execution capability. Further, the condition of "active within the preceding 24 months" may be restrictive, as organizations with prior established presence and proven experience in the state may be excluded despite having the ability to quickly mobilize and operationalize centres as required. In view of the above, we kindly request the authority to consider allowing group companies' presence and relaxing the strict timeline condition, so that the objective of ensuring adequate geographic coverage and service capability is effectively achieved, while also enabling wider participation of experienced and capable bidders.</p>	<p>The clause ensures actual operational presence and readiness within Gujarat. Therefore: - Only bidder's own operational centres/offices shall be considered. - The requirement of activity within the preceding 24 months shall remain applicable. The existing criteria shall remain unchanged.</p>
16	<p>Kindly clarify the estimated number of registered construction workers and/or dependents proposed to be trained annually under this EOI, at the state and/or district level.</p>	<p>The training targets will be allocated to empanelled TSPs based on capacity of each TSP, project requirements, demand and availability of funds. Exact numbers are not fixed at this stage and may vary annually and geographically.</p>
17	<p>The EOI emphasizes NSQF alignment; however, the course durations mentioned in Annexure 7 (e.g. 120 hrs, 390 hrs, etc.) differ from standard NSQF QP/NOS durations for similar job roles. Kindly clarify whether these courses are: Customized or bridge programs under GICS, Modular or partial NOS aligned programs, or Fully mapped to approved NSQF QP/NOS. Additionally, will formal QP-NOS mapping/equivalence documentation be shared with empanelled TSPs?</p>	<p>The courses under GICS are primarily aligned with NSQF/QP-NOS standards. However, depending on program design, bridge/customized modules may be used to meet beneficiary needs. Detailed curriculum and mapping will be shared with empanelled TSPs.</p>
18	<p>Kindly clarify whether trade specific infrastructure, tools, and equipment norms will be issued separately by KSU, or whether existing SSC/NSQF norms should be followed by TSPs for CAPEX planning.</p>	<p>TSPs are required to comply with KSU-prescribed standards based on curriculum developed inline with SSC/NSQF standards. Where specific guidelines are not separately issued in course curriculum, relevant SSC/NSQF norms shall be followed. Additional requirements(if any) will be communicated by KSU from time to time.</p>
19	<p>Please clarify whether the training targets allocated to empanelled TSPs will be: Front loaded or staggered across the year and Allocated job role wise, geography wise, or on demand basis</p>	<p>Training targets will be allocated by KSU in a phased/staggered manner, based on job roles, geographic requirements, and demand assessment.</p>
20	<p>Please clarify whether the proposed certification framework, specifically whether certificates issued upon course completion will be: Issued solely under KSU branding, or Jointly issued with SSC/NCVET, or Mapped to existing NCVET approved qualifications.</p>	<p>Certification shall be issued by KSU. The certification format shall be as approved by the KSU Authority.</p>
21	<p>Details regarding the total training target under this Eoi.</p>	<p>The training targets are not fixed at this stage and will be allocated to empanelled TSPs based on capacity of each TSP, project requirements, demand, geographic distribution, and availability of funds.</p>
22	<p>Clarification on the turnover criteria specified in the Eoi. We also request you to kindly consider providing relaxation in the turnover requirement, given our extensive experience and ongoing projects in the skill development sector</p>	<p>The minimum turnover criteria (₹100 Cr average over last 3 years) is part of the eligibility conditions to ensure financial capability of bidders. Hence, no relaxation in turnover criteria shall be provided.</p>
23	<p>Request to consider combined turnover in case of consortium</p>	<p>As per EOI provisions (Section 7.3), turnover shall be considered only for the Lead Bidder. Combined turnover of consortium members shall not be considered.</p>