



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR HIRING OF TRANSACTION ADVISORS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE VACCINE PRODUCTION PLANT AT LAHORE UNDER PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (PPP) MODE

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 issued on **17th April 2026**) (the **RFP Document**) in respect of the bidding process relating to hiring a consultancy firm / consortium for transaction advisory for Establishment of Foot and Mouth Disease Vaccine Production Plant at Lahore (the **Project**).

This Response Document is being circulated by the Livestock and Dairy Development Department (“**L&DDD**” or the “**Implementing Agency**”), 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 L&DDD 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. L&DDD expressly disavows 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 21st April 2026, and subsequently through email(s), in respect of the Request of Proposals issued by L&DDD in relation to the captioned project.

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
1.	<p>This is a high-value and highly specialized project, and it will be the first of its kind in Pakistan. Due to the absence of local technical professionals with relevant experience in this field, we have approached several multinational companies to explore the possibility of forming a consortium or obtaining their specialized services. Some of these companies are expected to visit Pakistan in the first week of May 2026. They require additional time to review the bidding documents and provide their proposals accordingly.</p> <p>In view of the above, we respectfully request that the deadline for submission of pre-bid suggestions be extended by one week, and the deadline for submission of technical and financial bids be extended by at least two weeks.</p>	<p>Bid submission has been extended 18th May 2026. Time of the submission and opening of bids remains the same</p>
2.	<p>We are currently in the process of preparing our clarifications/comments on the RFP titled “Hiring of Transaction Advisors for Establishment of Foot and Mouth Disease Vaccine Production Plant at Lahore.”</p> <p>In this regard, we kindly request an extension of one week for the submission of our clarifications/comments (currently due on 21 April).</p>	<p>Not accepted</p>
3.	<p>Reference RFP: 6.3– Scoring System Sub-criteria 2</p> <p>RFP Requirements: Experience of financial advisory services during the last 15 years of a project pertaining to <i>development of pharmaceutical manufacturing/vaccine production manufacturing</i> at the cost of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent by the financial member of the Consortium.</p> <p>Suggested Change: The current requirement appears narrowly tailored to only pharmaceutical and vaccine production projects, which may unduly restrict competition. Such specific experience may be relevant for the technical partner; however, it may not be necessary or appropriate for financial advisory firms.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Procuring Entity consider expanding the technical evaluation criterion relating to experience of financial advisory services to include health sector projects.</p>	<p>Query is valid, the revised criterion is:</p> <p>Experience of financial advisory services during the last 15 years of a project pertaining to development of pharmaceutical manufacturing/vaccine production manufacturing or healthcare industry at the cost of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent by the financial member of the Consortium.</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<p>Suggested Revision:</p> <p>Experience of financial advisory services during the last 15 years for projects pertaining to the health sector, including but not limited to pharmaceutical manufacturing, vaccine production manufacturing, hospitals, medical infrastructure, diagnostics, healthcare systems, or other related health sector developments, at a cost of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent, by the financial member of the Consortium.</p>	
4.	<p>Key Professional Staff: Age limit = 65 years</p> <p>It is suggested that the requirement prescribing an age limit of 65 years for project team members be reconsidered and excluded. This condition may unnecessarily deprive the project of highly experienced professionals whose expertise, sector knowledge, and proven track record could significantly contribute to the successful execution of the assignment.</p>	<p>The assignment requires resources who demonstrate strong familiarity with recent developments in the field, as well as the level of responsiveness and engagement needed to meet the demands of the role. Accordingly, this request cannot be accepted.</p>
5.	<p>3a.Financial Capability</p> <p>Average annual turnover of last three (3) years: PKR 1,000 million or above 04 marks PKR 500 to less than 1,000 million 03 marks PKR 250 to less than 500 million 02 marks</p> <p>It is suggested that the turnover thresholds be revised to better reflect market realities and promote broader competition among qualified firms. The current maximum slab of PKR 1,000 million or above may be unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>Suggested Revised Scoring Slabs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKR 500 million or above – 04 marks • PKR 250 million to less than PKR 500 million – 03 marks • PKR 200 million to less than PKR 250 million – 02 marks <p>It is further suggested that, in the case of a Consortium, the collective turnover of all consortium members be considered, rather than limiting financial capability assessment to the Lead Member only. Since consortium structures are intended to combine complementary strengths and resources, considering aggregate turnover would more appropriately reflect the overall financial capacity of the team and avoid unnecessarily restricting participation.</p>	<p>The revised scoring slabs will be as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PKR 500 million or above – 04 marks - PKR 350 million to less than PKR 500 million – 03 marks - PKR 200 million to less than PKR 350 million – 02 marks <p>However, in the case of a Consortium, the turnover of only lead member will be considered to assess the financial capability of the consortium/firm.</p>
6.	<p>Kindly look into the following for revising the RFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Consultants age limitation of 65 years is very unusual. Kindly remove the age limit. 2. Exp and transection of Rs. 5 billion is on very high side. To have maximum participation this limit may be reduced 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted 2. Not accepted

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<p>3. As this proposal will require external / international technical team also, contacting them will take time. Thus it is requested that closing date may be extended at least 2 weeks.</p>	<p>3. Please refer to response to query no. 1</p>
7.	<p><u>Request for Clarifications / Proposed Amendments on RFP for “Hiring of Transaction Advisors for Establishment of Foot and Mouth Disease Vaccine Production Plant at Lahore” by I-Consultant</u></p> <p>We kindly request that responses to these queries be issued in the form of an official Addendum / Corrigendum at the earliest, preferably soon after the Pre-Bid meeting scheduled for 21 April 2026 , so that all prospective bidders may incorporate the same while preparing their proposals.</p> <p>Queries / Requests for Clarification:</p> <p>Minimum Technical Qualifying Score (Inconsistency between Sections)</p> <p>-Data Sheet (Para 2.29) and Section 2.19.3 / 2.21.1 mention a minimum technical score of 65 out of 100.</p> <p>- However, Section 6.1.1 states that only proposals scoring 75 marks or more shall qualify.</p>	<p>It is typographical mistake.</p> <p>Please read it as 75 in 2.19.3, 2.21.1, point 10 of datasheet and 6A of Section 6</p>
8.	<p>Experience Criterion for Financial Member of Consortium (Section 6.3–Firm’s Relevant Experience)</p> <p>The current criterion requires “Experience of financial advisory services of a project pertaining to the development [of] pharmaceutical manufacturing / Vaccine Production manufacturing at the cost of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent” (02 or more projects = 8 marks).</p> <p>Request: Kindly clarify and confirm that for all experience criteria under Section 6.3, acceptable evidence shall include any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion Certificate / Client Satisfaction Letter (on client letterhead), OR • Signed Contract Agreement / Work Order, 	<p>Please note that Bidders shall attach supporting document / evidence of experience. The evidence may be completion certificate or client satisfaction letter or any sufficient evidence that the relevant deliverable has been completed and submitted to the client. Consultancy agreements shall also be presented in the bids, however, mere submission of consultancy agreement or work order will not suffice the requirement.</p>
9.	<p>Financial Capability – Average Annual Turnover of Lead Member (Section 6.3 – 3a)</p> <p>Kindly revise the turnover slabs to more realistic levels for consulting firms</p>	<p>Please refer to response to query no. 5</p>
10.	<p>We kindly request a three (3) week extension to the submission deadline i.e., until 26 May 2026. We are in early discussions with a foreign technical advisor who is central to our proposed approach and is currently reviewing the RFP. Given their review timeline and the time-zone coordination involved, we would appreciate additional time to finalize the technical details and submit a well-prepared proposal.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to query no. 1</p>
11.	<p>We request that the technical evaluation criteria outlined under clause 6.3 scoring criteria (page # 48) pertaining to financial advisor’s experience in providing financial advisory services to be broadened beyond</p>	<p>Please refer to response to query no. 3</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<p>pharmaceutical/vaccine manufacturing experience to include firms with broader healthcare sector experience. Given the project's specialized requirements and the limited number of PPP engagements completed in this specific segment, the current criteria may unintentionally narrow competition to a very small pool of bidders. Broadening the eligibility framework would attract more qualified firms and strengthen the overall quality and competitiveness of the bidding process.</p>	
12.	<p>Pg#13 Section 2.13 – Prequalification Proposal, Clause 2.13.1</p> <p>Valid registration with the relevant professional body i.e. (e.g. PEC, PCATP, ICAP, ICMA or any other pertinent professional body etc.), where applicable</p> <p>Financial consulting and transaction advisory firms primarily provide financial, commercial, and PPP advisory services rather than engineering, architecture, or statutory audit/accountancy practice requiring mandatory firm-level registration with bodies such as PEC, PCATP, ICAP, or ICMA. Such firms operating in this domain are generally not required to hold these registrations as a corporate entity. However, in many cases, the partners of such firms are professionally qualified and registered with relevant accounting bodies such as ICAP or ACCA. In this regard, kindly confirm whether the professional registration of the firm's partners would be considered sufficient to meet this requirement, particularly since firm-level ICAP or ICMA registration is generally applicable to audit and assurance firms.</p>	<p>It has already been stated that this requirement of registration with relevant professional body is needed <i>where applicable</i>.</p>
13.	<p>Average annual turnover of last three (3) years PKR 1,000 million or above.</p> <p>Bidders (in case of Consortium, Lead Member) to submit audited financial statements of last three years. In case of a Consortium, financial capability of only the Lead Member will be considered</p> <p>We respectfully submit that this condition may unnecessarily limit participation from otherwise highly qualified consortiums where the combined financial strength of all consortium members is substantial, but the Lead Member alone may not fully satisfy the prescribed turnover thresholds. Since consortium arrangements are formed to bring together complementary technical, financial, and sectoral expertise, evaluating only the Lead Member's turnover may not accurately reflect the overall financial capacity and execution strength of the bidding team.</p> <p>Allowing cumulative turnover of all consortium members or at least considering the financial strength of major consortium partners alongside the Lead Member, would encourage broader participation from competent firms while maintaining financial robustness and delivery capability.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to query no. 5</p>
14.	<p>Extension of Consultancy Timeline: Based on feedback from multiple consultants and consortium members, we respectfully recommend that the consultancy duration be extended by an additional 30 days to ensure comprehensive planning and accurate deliverables.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to query no. 1</p>
15.	<p>Inclusion of Key Technical Expertise: We note that the currently proposed team structure does not include certain critical experts required to adequately assess and estimate the technical and financial requirements of the proposed plants, particularly the Foot-and-Mouth Disease (FMD) vaccine manufacturing plant. Given that</p>	<p>This reflects an incorrect understanding of the assignment. The purpose of this procurement is to engage consultants for</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response									
	<p>only a limited number of such large-scale facilities exist globally, it is essential to involve professionals with specialized experience in their design and operation.</p> <p>We strongly recommend the inclusion of the following experts in the consultancy team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Industrial Management Experts b. Bioprocess Engineers c. Plant Operations Experts 	<p>the project, not a contractor for its development and O&M. Accordingly, the team composition specified in the RFP is appropriate. Only one change to the key professional staff (i.e. Bioprocess Engineer) is considered.</p> <p>Please see revised scoring criteria of Technical Team at Annexure-A.</p>									
16.	<p>Observations on Team Leader Qualifications: We observe that the currently proposed qualification criteria for the Team Leader requires exposure to PPP structuring, Infrastructure finance, Large-scale pharma and industrial project development. Additionally, the Team Leader is required to have proven expertise in preparation of bankable feasibility studies, CAPEX and OPEX estimation, Concession agreement development and working experience with regulatory bodies including DRAP, WOA, and other relevant authorities.</p> <p>Such a combination of qualifications and expertise is extremely rare and may not be available in a single individual. We recommend that these required competencies be distributed across the consortium team (Technical, Financial, and Legal members) rather than concentrated in a single Team Leader. Alternatively, the Team Leader may be supported by a Deputy Team Leader with complementary expertise.</p>	<p>The qualification and expertise requirements have already been appropriately addressed in the RFP and are distributed across the overall composition of the consultant team in a balanced manner. The Team Leader's criteria are aligned with the coordination and leadership role, while specialized competencies are covered through other key experts. Accordingly, no change is considered necessary.</p>									
17.	<p>Proposed Revisions to Qualification and Scoring System: Based on our analysis of the proposed scoring system, we respectfully submit the following observations and recommended revisions:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="180 1089 1419 1227"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="180 1089 596 1130">Parameter</th> <th data-bbox="596 1089 995 1130">Original RFP</th> <th data-bbox="995 1089 1419 1130">Proposed Revision</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="180 1130 596 1179">Experience Period</td> <td data-bbox="596 1130 995 1179">Last 15 years</td> <td data-bbox="995 1130 1419 1179">Last 5 years</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="180 1179 596 1227">Minimum Project Cost</td> <td data-bbox="596 1179 995 1227">Rs. 5 billion (500 crore)</td> <td data-bbox="995 1179 1419 1227">Rs. 100 million (10 crore)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Parameter	Original RFP	Proposed Revision	Experience Period	Last 15 years	Last 5 years	Minimum Project Cost	Rs. 5 billion (500 crore)	Rs. 100 million (10 crore)	<p>The criteria have been developed in line with the level of expertise and experience required for projects of a scale and complexity comparable to the subject project. Accordingly, the requested changes are not considered.</p>
Parameter	Original RFP	Proposed Revision									
Experience Period	Last 15 years	Last 5 years									
Minimum Project Cost	Rs. 5 billion (500 crore)	Rs. 100 million (10 crore)									
18.	<p>Additional Recommendations: Based on the above observations, we submit the following revised scoring system with additional bonus marks for your kind consideration:</p> <p>WHO Pre-qualification or WOA endorsement for any team member's prior vaccine project (5 bonus marks) Experience of feasibility studies for BSL-3/BSL-3+ facilities (additional 3 marks)</p>	<p>Not accepted</p>									

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
19.	<p>6.3 Scoring System 1: Experience of financial advisory services during the last 15 years of a project pertaining to the development pharmaceutical manufacturing/Vaccine Production manufacturing at the cost of Rs. 5 billion or equivalent) by financial member of the Consortium.</p> <p>a. We recommend that the definition of Financial Advisory Services be expanded to include financial due diligence and valuation assignments, in addition to financial feasibility services.</p> <p>b. In light of this expanded definition, the minimum project cost threshold of PKR 5 billion (or equivalent) should be removed, as valuation and financial due diligence assignments are typically carried out for existing companies, for which a project cost threshold is not applicable.</p> <p>c. Furthermore, it is requested that, for certain public and private sector projects, a signed engagement letter or contract be expressly recognized as satisfactory documentary evidence.</p>	<p>a. a. The term “Financial Advisory Services” is broad in scope and includes assignments such as financial due diligence and valuation.</p> <p>b. For assignments involving financial due diligence or valuation, the Bidder may indicate the value of the target company or the entity for which the assignment was undertaken. The specified project cost threshold shall apply to all categories of financial advisory services.</p> <p>c. Submission of only an engagement letter or contract shall not be considered sufficient evidence. Please refer to the response to Query No. 8 for further clarification.</p>
20.	<p>6.3 Scoring System 1: 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 15 years</p> <p>It is suggested that the requirement “completed PPP project (up to financial closure / signing of loan agreement)” be broadened and amended as follows:</p> <p>a. “Completed PPP project, supported by satisfactory documentary evidence, such as a signed engagement letter, contract, or agreement with the client, or evidence of financial closure or signing of a loan agreement; any one of these shall be deemed sufficient.”</p> <p>b. Furthermore, for private sector projects, it should be explicitly stated that a signed engagement letter or contract will also be accepted as satisfactory documentary evidence.</p>	<p>a. Not accepted. Demonstrated experience of the firm on projects that have successfully achieved financial close is necessary.</p> <p>b. Not accepted</p>
21.	<p>Evaluation sub criteria for qualifications and competence of key staff: Financial Team Leader</p>	<p>Not accepted. Demonstrated experience of the expert on projects that have</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	<p>It is suggested that the requirement “Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to financial closure)” may be broadened and amended as follows: “Experience of end-to-end transaction advisory services, without the requirement of achieving financial closure, supported by satisfactory documentary evidence such as signed engagement letters, contracts, or agreements with the client.”</p>	<p>successfully achieved financial close is necessary.</p>
22.	<p>Evaluation sub criteria for qualifications and competence of key staff: Project Finance/ PPP Specialist</p> <p>It is suggested that the requirement “Experience of complete transaction advisory services (up to financial closure)” may be broadened and amended as follows: “Experience of end-to-end transaction advisory services, without the requirement of achieving financial closure, supported by satisfactory documentary evidence such as signed engagement letters, contracts, or agreements with the client.”</p>	<p>Not accepted. Demonstrated experience of the expert on projects that have successfully achieved financial close is necessary.</p>
23.	<p>Note on Sub-consultant scoring: Sub-consultants’ experience / credentials shall not be eligible for scoring. Only consortium members will be eligible for scoring.</p> <p>In this regard, it is requested that the experience of at least technical sub-consultants be considered for evaluation purposes. This request is made in view of practical constraints associated with engaging international technical firms as consortium members. In certain cases, due to foreign exchange regulations, tax considerations, and currency repatriation restrictions, the procuring agency may face challenges in making direct payments to an international technical firm if included as a consortium member.</p> <p>Accordingly, bidders may be required to engage such international technical firms as sub-consultants rather than consortium members, despite their critical role in project delivery. Disallowing consideration of their experience may inadvertently limit participation of qualified international expertise and reduce overall competition.</p> <p>It is therefore requested that the experience of technical sub-consultants, where they have a clearly defined and substantive role, be allowed for evaluation purposes, subject to appropriate safeguards.</p>	<p>Experience or credentials of sub-consultants will not be considered for scoring. It has been observed that sub-consultants typically have a lower level of responsibility and commitment compared to members of the advisory consortium. Accordingly, all key technical experts are required to be part of the consortium.</p> <p>The implementing agency, along with the Government of Punjab, will provide necessary facilitation in relation to permits, approvals and processing of payments. All applicable taxes and regulatory requirements shall apply in accordance with prevailing laws.</p>
24.	<p>Financial viability assessment report: The RFP requires submission of a financial model; however, the responsibility for key underlying assumptions—particularly operational and maintenance costs (including cost of sales, administrative expenses, and other operating parameters)—is not explicitly defined.</p> <p>In this regard, it is requested that the RFP explicitly clarify the allocation of responsibilities among consortium members for development and validation of key assumptions used in the financial model.</p>	<p>The terms of reference and scope of advisory services are clearly defined in the RFP document. The roles and responsibilities of the technical, financial and other members of the advisory consortium are also well delineated. It is the responsibility of the</p>

No.	Query / Clarification	Response
	Specifically, it is requested that all operational and technical assumptions (including plant efficiency, capacity utilization, input requirements, O&M costs, and lifecycle assumptions) be the responsibility of the technical/engineering consultant and the financial advisor be responsible solely for incorporating these inputs into the financial model and undertaking financial analysis based on the assumptions provided.	Consultants to fully understand the assignment and the respective roles of each team member in delivering the services.

Note: A Bid submitted by each Bidder must be accompanied by a Bid Security in an amount of Rs. One Million (Rs. 1,000,000), which shall remain valid for a period of at least thirty-one (31) days beyond the original Bid Validity Period (minimum 90 days) making it a total of minimum one hundred and twenty-one (121) days from the proposal submission deadline. (Section 2.18.1 of RFP)

ANNEXURE – A

TECHNICAL TEAM

Original	Revised
Team Leader 04 marks	Team Leader 03 marks
Virologist / Vaccinologist 03 marks	Virologist / Vaccinologist 03 marks
Pharmacist 03 marks	Pharmacist 03 marks
Biochemist 02 marks	Biochemist 02 marks
Civil Engineer 02 marks	Bioprocess Engineer 02 marks
Mechanical Engineer 02 marks	Civil Engineer 02 marks
Environment Specialist 01marks	Mechanical Engineer 01 marks
	Environment Specialist 01marks
Total 17 marks	Total 17 marks
	Bioprocess Engineer (Scoring Criteria)
	Qualification: Masters in in Bioprocess Engineering (25%)
	Relevant Experience: Experience in Biopharmaceuticals / vaccine manufacturing / biologics
	More than 10 years 75%
	7 years to less than 10 years 60%
	5 years to less than 7 years 40%
	Less than 5 years 20%