

**Corrigendum No. : 04**

**Tender Reference :LSGD/PD/34467/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34469/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34470/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34497/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34485/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34486/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34487/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34490/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34491/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34492/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34494/2025-TCPB3, LSGD/PD/34495/2025-TCPB3**

**Tender ID : 2025\_CTP\_818145\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818353\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818362\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818372\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818399\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818419\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818431\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818443\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818448\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818452\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818456\_1, 2025\_CTP\_818465\_1**

**Title: Consultancy Services for formulation of GIS based Master Plan for four Towns in Kerala State (Cluster 1-12) under the sub-scheme of AMRUT 2.0**

**CORRIGENDUM ISSUED IN RESPONSE TO QUERIES AND SUGGESTIONS ON RfP**

The pre-bid meeting was held on 20/11/2025 at 11:00 AM in hybrid mode for the works of “Consultancy Services for Formulation of GIS Based Master Plans for Four/Five Towns (Clusters 1-12) Under the Sub-scheme of AMRUT 2.0”.

The prospective bidders raised various queries and submitted suggestions for modifications in the conditions of the Request for Proposal (RfP) document.

Based on the discussions and deliberations, the following amendments/clarifications are made in response to the queries/suggestions raised by the participants as given below: -

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
1	2.7.5.	16	Request for waiver from tender fees & EMD for MSMEs in compliance with S.O.581(E) published under the gazette of India as “public procurement policy for micro and small enterprises (MSEs) order, 2012” – kindly Refer to clause 10 which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Guides to the public procurement process to</li></ul>	Tender fees & Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) for MSEs are exempted subject to eligibility. Also see Amendment No. 2 & 12 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p>provide tender sets at free of cost to Registered MSMEs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exempts them from payment of earnest money deposits (EMD) to Registered MSMEs</li> </ul>	
2	2.8.2.1	21-23	<p>Request to alter the text to;</p> <p>1(a) Specific experience of the consulting firm in the formulation of statutory Master Plans / Structure Plan/ Development Plans for Cities or Towns in India</p> <p>Maximum five (5) numbers of Master plan(s) / Structure plan / Development plan(s) / GIS Master plan(s) for Cities / Towns / Urban infrastructure formulated by the bidder and each of them satisfying all the following criteria:</p> <p>All such plans shall be for areas within India,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning area of each such plan shall be for an extent of at least 5 sq.km.</li> <li>All such plans prepared shall be GIS based.</li> <li>Such works should have been awarded from the year 2010 onwards.</li> <li>Current Stage of such Plan shall be any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan finally sanctioned by competent authority as per applicable statute (or)</li> <li>Draft Plan published by competent authority as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p>per applicable statute.</p> <p>(In case of JV/consortium, the works of both members in the JV/consortium can be considered)</p> <p>(Maximum 5 works) [Final Plan sanctioned: 7 Marks each</p> <p>Draft Plan Published: 5 Marks each]</p> <p>Documents to be submitted:</p> <p>Information on such plans each separately in TP Form: 5A duly filled and signed together with enclosures as stipulated in such form.</p> <p>1(b) Experience and capabilities of the Consulting firm in other works awarded from the year 2010 onwards in India or abroad</p> <p>1(b) (i) Experience in the preparation of Local Area Plan / Detailed Town Planning Schemes, Town Planning Scheme / Land Pooling Scheme / GIS Master Plan / Tourism Master Plan / Coastal Master Plan in India/Abroad.</p> <p>(iii) Experience in preparing Municipal Finance Management / Transaction Advisory and Revenue Augmentation Reports / Studies for Any Government / PSUs In India or Abroad.</p> <p>(iv) Experience in GIS based base Map preparation for various Urban Utilities/ Infrastructure / GIS based</p>	

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p>Data Collection And updating For Municipal Property Tax Improvement / Urban Infrastructure / Any Other Infrastructure Development in India or Abroad. <i>[excluding the works specified in 1 (a), 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii)].</i></p> <p>(v) Experience in preparing Environment Management Plan / Environmental Impact Study of Infrastructure Projects / Marine Impact Study of Infrastructure Projects / Watershed Development Plan / Rehabilitation and Resettlement Plans / Tourism Plan / Coastal Tourism Plan for large scale Infrastructure Projects / Slum Redevelopment Plan / Township / Neighbourhood ITPI Development Layout Plans/or Similar Planning Projects. <i>[excluding the works specified in 1(a), 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii)]</i></p>	
3	2.8.2.2	24	Senior Planner - Master's degree in planning and at least 10 years' experience in Planning.	Strictly as per the amendment in Clause 2.8.2.2. See Amendment No. 6, 7 & 13 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum.
4	2.8.4.4, 2.8.3	29, 35	Please share the ceiling amount prescribed for each town under the project.	With reference to AMRUT 2.0 Reforms Agenda issued by MoHUA in August 2022, the maximum unit cost for each town is Rupees 70 Lakhs. (This is inclusive of GST)
5	2.2.9	9	Confirm whether a company can bid for one cluster independently and at the same time bid for another cluster as part of a joint venture (JV).	No. Strictly as per RfP.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
6	3.7	25	Clarification on whether staff engaged in one cluster can be interchanged or deployed in another cluster if our firm handles two clusters.	Not allowed in the case of Key Professionals and Support professionals.
7	2.2.8 (1)	7	Request to allow the bidder be a society in India Registered under the Society's Act 1960, having relevant professional experience in the preparation of statutory GIS based master plans in India, as eligible to participate for these bids.	See Amendment No. 1 in Annexure – I to this corrigendum.
8	2.8.1 (3)	20	Request to modify the clause to average annual turnover of Lead member be at least Rs.3 crores and that of consortium member be at least Rs.2 crores.	Strictly as per RfP
9	2.2.9 (5)	8	Request to relax the clause and not keep it mandatory to be as Lead Bidder	Strictly as per RfP
10	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (i)]	22	Request to consider the preparation of Land Development Plans, DPRs for Lake Development Plans in Cities/ Towns, City Development Plans in India; also, as eligible projects under this criterion.	Strictly as per RfP. Also see Amendment No. 3 & 4 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum.
11	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (iii)]	23	Request to consider the preparation of Infrastructure Development & Investment Plans for Cities/ Towns in India; as also eligible projects under these criteria.	Strictly as per RfP. Also see Amendment No. 4 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum.
12	2.8.3	29	Request to consider excluding GST, as the consultancy fees in general excluding the GST, as the applicable GST is to be payable by the consultant to the government.	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
13	3.1	44	<p>Clarification on whether the Master Plan is to be prepared only for the town/ Municipality Area, Or Any Adjoining Villages are also getting covered in the extent of planning area specified. If yes, please provide the details of the villages covered along with their areas and population breakup.</p> <p>Request to provide the indicative AOI boundary map for each of the town/s for each cluster for better understanding of the planning area, and in the preparation of technical methodology and work plan.</p>	<p>Master Plan is to be prepared for the Municipality Area.</p> <p>Extent of Planning area is already mentioned in RfP. (Table-1, Clause 2.2.5 &amp; Table 11 Clause 3.1.1)</p>
14	3.3.2.2	49	Request to revise household survey sample size.	Strictly as per RfP
15	3.3.3.1 Task 1 (3)	52	Clarification on whether the Cadastral maps/ layers to be provided by the client, will be in GIS format (shape files), or scanned copy of village maps in PDF format, or will be in hard copy of village maps.	Cadastral maps will be provided as scanned copy/hard copy. Wherever GIS format (shapefiles) are available with the client, they will be also be shared.
16	3.4 Table 12	64-69	Request to revise/increase early-stage payment percentages and restructure payment schedule.	Strictly as per RfP
17	3.7.2.1	72-73	Request to modify this clause as one junior planner, one GIS professional and one infrastructure planner; be engaged at site/ locally' and the other three support professionals can be engaged at consultant home office and be available at site at any time as per the project requirement.	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
18	3.7.2.4	73	Request to modify the clause as at least 50% of the support professionals be local candidates.	See Amendment No. 10 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum. However, proficiency in Malayalam is essential for Support Professionals.
19	Table 10 Sl. No. 10	39	Request for extension of bid submission closing date by 2-4 weeks after publishing pre-bid meeting minutes as corrigendum.	The critical dates have been changed and corrigendum is published in the e-tender Portal. The particulars as on date are as follows: Bid submission start date: 02.12.2025, 10.00 AM Bid submission end date : 29.12.2025, 3.00 PM Bid opening date:30.12.2025, 3.00P M
20	2.8 Table 3 Sl. No. 5	20,21	Request to include “Land Use and Development Control Plan (LUDCP). “	Strictly as per RfP
21	2.8.2 [1(b) (ii)]	22	Request to include provisions for “DPR for Industrial Development/ Local Area Development.”	Strictly as per RfP
22	2.8.2 [1(b) (iii)]	23	Request to consider a single order that consists of various municipalities which are in line with your scope of work.	Strictly as per RfP
23	2.8.2 [1(b) (v)]	23	Request to consider this as a single consolidated order comprising multiple municipalities. The experience related to the mentioned components may please be accepted collectively, as all these activities were executed as part of a comprehensive Master Plan project, and not as separate individual projects.	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
24	2.8.2.2 Table 8	26	Confirm whether support professionals must be stationed full-time in Kerala or can work in hybrid mode with periodic site visits.	Strictly as per RfP. Also refer to Clause 3.7.2 of RfP.
25	2.8.2.2	29	Request to deploy the same Key Professionals across multiple clusters.	Strictly as per RfP
26	2.2.8 (1)		The eligibility criteria in the RfP may be amended to allow academic institutions to submit proposals individually	Not considered.
27	2.8.2.1 [1(b)(ii)]	22	Request to remove experience from the preparation of Master Plans/ Development Plans for Cities or Towns (those published or sanctioned) as it is already asked in 1(a).  Request to add project experience for preparation of master plan for new cities/ town under the 15 <sup>th</sup> finance commission or similar (if required).	Regarding Clause 2.8.2.1, Table 4, Sl No: 1(b)(ii), strictly as per RfP. Also see Amendment No. 4 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
28	2.8.2.1	22	Request to re-look at the requirement to submit at least 20 projects to get the full mark for the project experience under each category of project (works specifies in 1(a), 1(b) (i), 1(b) (ii), 1(b) (iii), 1(b) (iv) and 1(b) (v)).	Strictly as per RfP
29	Table 10 Sl. No. 18	40	Request to remove this requirement and provide office space for necessary deployment of support staff at client office at respective district/ town.	Strictly as per RfP



Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
30	3.1.2.1	44	Request to share the list of base layers available and sample drawings.	Orthorectified Drone Images and feature extracted layers such as Roads, building footprints, water bodies etc. as received from SoI (one sample shown in the pre-bid meeting) will be provided by Client to the Consultant after execution of Contract as per RfP.
31	2.8.2 [1(b) (i)]	22	Request to delete the work experience of preparation of GIS Based Master/Development Plan since it is totally different than preparation of town planning scheme/land pooling scheme.  Request to allot marks for turnover and experience in preparation of GIS Based Master Plan.	Strictly as per RfP
32	2.8.2 [1(b) (iii)]	23	Request to omit Municipal Finance Management and Augmentation Reports from work experiences.	Strictly as per RfP
33	2.8.2 C Table No. 7	25,26	Since all the key persons outside the state may not get an opportunity to work in Kerala state for one year period. Therefore 1 Mark of experience may be deleted, and this 1 Marks may be assigned in the overall experience of resource persons.	Strictly as per RfP
34	3.3.3.1 (9)	52	Request for an official confirmation regarding the estimated and acceptable timeframe (Service Level Agreement) for the entire process involving the submission of draft base maps to the Survey of India (SoI) for verification and the subsequent return of the	Please refer to Clause 3.4.1 (Table 12) and the note thereunder regarding Processing time. Specific time frame cannot be assigned by the client for verification and return of final basemaps from SoI.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			final base maps. This is critical for scheduling the assignment.	
35	2.8.2.2, Table 5	24	Request to modify the clause as follows; M. Tech in Geo-Informatics / Remote Sensing/ M. Planning or Equivalent and at least 08 years' experience (or) Master's Degree in Geo-Informatics or Master's Degree in Urban or Regional Planning/Geography/ Geology / Science with PG Diploma in GIS/Geo- Informatics /Remote Sensing and at least 10 years' experience in relevant field (or) Bachelor's Degree in Planning/Engineering Technology with PG Diploma or certification course in GIS/Geo- Informatics /Remote Sensing and at least 10 years' experience in relevant field	Strictly as per RfP
36	Table 10 Sl. No 7	39	Confirm whether the Client can grant Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) exemption to firms registered as MSMEs registered entities, in adherence to the relevant provisions and guidelines of the General Financial Rules (GFR) 2017.	Tender fees & Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) for MSEs are exempted subject to eligibility. Also see Amendment No. 2 & 12 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
37	2.8.2.6	28	Will Master Plans prepared specifically under the Smart Cities Mission or other State-funded GIS-based Development Plans be eligible for consideration toward satisfying the mandatory requirement of submitting three statutory Master Plans (with an area of 25 sq.km), even if these plans are non-statutory or	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			prepared under a different legislative framework?	
38	2.8	20,21	<p>Request to modify the clause as follows;</p> <p>5. The bidder should have formulated at least 3 Master Plan(s) / Structure Plan / City Vision Plans/ Smart City Plans/Development Plan(s) for Cities / Towns and each of them satisfying all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All such plans shall be for areas within India, .....</li> <li>• Such plans should have been <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sanctioned (final) as per applicable statute (or)</li> <li>○ published (draft) as per applicable statute (or)</li> <li>○ ongoing (50 % or above payment received)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(In case of JV/consortium, the work(s) undertaken by any of the firm in the JV/Consortium can be considered as the work(s) undertaken by the bidder)</p>	<p>In the case of clause 2.8.1, Table 3, Sl No: 3, strictly as per RfP.</p> <p>With reference to the experiences of the bidder in relevant fields as per clause 2.8.2.1 also, if the bidder is a JV/consortium, the work(s) undertaken by any of the firm in the JV/Consortium can be considered as the work(s) undertaken by the bidder.</p> <p>Also see Amendment No. 5 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum</p>
39	3.4	64	Please confirm if the payment can be released separately for each town upon approval of that town's deliverables, instead of releasing the entire payment for the cluster together.	Yes, subject to conditions stipulated in the RfP. (Refer Clause 3.4)
40	3.4	64	If the 1 <sup>st</sup> instalment from GoI is delayed, will it affect the consultant's payment and subsequent deliverable	Conditions for payments are as specified in RfP. (Refer Clause 3.4 and the last Column of Table

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			timelines. Please clarify the mechanism to avoid impact on deliverable durations.	12). The consultant is expected to have necessary financial capacity to carry forward with the assignment and deliverables as per schedule, in case of such exigencies.
41	2.2.9	9	It is requested that the Client allow flexibility to modify or form different JV/consortium combinations for separate clusters, provided each combination meets the eligibility and qualification criteria specified in the respective RFP. This relaxation will enhance competition and enable bidders to form the most suitable partnerships for each cluster.	Strictly as per RfP
42	3.3	46	Please confirm whether the Client will facilitate the collection of available GIS base maps, documents, reports, and other relevant data from concerned departments.	Refer Clause 5.0 of General Conditions of Contract read with Special Conditions of Contract in Section 6 of RfP.
43	3.3	47	Please clarify the expected number and scale of stakeholder consultations, and whether the Client will assist in finalizing the stakeholder list	As mentioned in Section 3 Terms of Reference (ToR).
44	3.3.2.2 Task 2	49	Please specify the reference year (2025 or any other) to be used for estimating the total households for determining the sample size in the Socio-Economic Survey.	The population estimate as per MoHUA for the year 2025 for the towns in Kerala shall be used for fixing the sample size. (The list of Towns and population are enclosed as Annexure III to this Corrigendum)
45	2.8.2.1 [1(a)]	21	Request to kindly consider ongoing Master Plan / Development Plan / DP projects apart from	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			completed projects, as several assignments are in advanced stages.	
46	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (iii)]	23	We understand that experience of Projects with scope of financial management shall be considered. Kindly confirm.	Strictly as per RfP. The experience is sought for studies/reports on Municipal finance management & revenue augmentation of cities/towns.
47	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (iv)]	23	Request to kindly consider ongoing GIS base map preparation and property tax GIS update projects, apart from completed projects.	Strictly as per RfP
48	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (v)]	23	Request to kindly consider environment and planning-related assignments which are part of DPRs or Master plans.	See Amendment No. 4 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
49	2.8.1 Table 3 SI No 4	20	Request to revise the clause as follows: The bidder shall have minimum of 3 years in consultancy services	Strictly as per RfP
50	2.2.8 (3)	8	Request to remove limit on number of clusters a bidder can bid for.	Strictly as per RfP
51	2.8.2	21	Request to review the evaluation parameters and remove the following clauses to ensure uniformity with AMRUT 2.0 norms and to encourage wider and fair participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 1(b)(i)</li> <li>• Clause 1(b)(ii)</li> </ul>	Strictly as per RfP.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 1(b)(iii)</li> <li>• Clause 1(b)(iv)</li> <li>• Clause 1(b)(v)</li> </ul> <p>Request to consider revising these criteria to bring them in line with the standard practice adopted under AMRUT 2.0 tenders nationwide.</p>	
52	3.3.3.1 (1)	51	Request to clarity on format of base layers (.shp / .gdb) and scale (1:1000 / 1:2000).	Both formats. One sample of Orthorectified Drone Image and the corresponding feature extracted layers as received from Sol were explained in the pre-bid meeting.
53	3.3.3.1 (1)	51	Please provide detailed feature class schema (domain values, attribute list) approved for AMRUT GIS Master Plans.	Refer “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
54	3.3.3.1 (2)	51	Request minimum turnaround time for approval (suggested 7 working days).	Survey Methodology shall be finalized in Consultation with District Town Planner.
55	3.3.3.1 (1)	51	Clarify if field data collection must use the MoHUA <i>Integrated Mobile Application</i> ONLY, or consultant can use its own tools if API integration is possible.	SANKALAN Mobile app issued by MoHUA is now functional. The corresponding link is <a href="https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/">https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/</a>  Also refer Clause 3.3.3.1(11) of RfP.
56	3.4.2	69,70	Request confirmation if both <i>Shapefile</i> AND <i>File Geodatabase (.gdb)</i> are mandatory, or GDB alone is acceptable.	Both mandatory

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
57	3.4.2	69,70	Confirm which ESRI version the Department uses (ArcGIS Pro or ArcMap 10.x).	ArcMap 10.x
58	3.1.2.2	45	Whether digital survey formats (e.g., XLS templates) will be provided for uniform data structure?	Consultation with District Town Planner shall be made for formulation of survey formats. Survey methodology and questionnaire shall be approved by the District Town Planner
59	3.3.3.1	51	Request specification of required horizontal accuracy (e.g., <30 cm RMSE).	Refer “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
60	3.3.4	54	Please specify mandatory thematic layers (e.g., LU, Zoning, Utilities, Transport) to avoid deviations across towns.	The expected layers are specified in “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
61	3.3.6.4	63	Confirm API/portal access will be provided to the consultant & whether staging environment exists.	The Consultant is expected to assist the Client in successfully uploading to the Portal as stipulated by TCPO/MoHUA, GoI.
62	3.2	46	Please clarify whether mobile app-based photos and coordinates must be time stamped + geo tagged.	Yes
63	3.3.3.3	54	Request to clarify whether hazard layers (flood zones, landslide zones, CRZ) will be provided by the state or consultant must procure.	Data from concerned agencies will be provided in available format.
64	3.4 Table 12	65	Request clarification on grid size (e.g., 500m x 500m or 1km x 1km).	In consultation with District Town Planners.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
65	3.4.2	69,70	Confirm if drone orthoimage will be given as GeoTIFF with coordinate system metadata.	Yes
66	3.3.1	46	Clarify if missing layers (e.g., utility networks) must be digitized by the consultant.	Yes, Missing layers has to be digitized by Consultant. Also, refer “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
67	3.4.2	69,70	Request written confirmation if these are “recommended” or “mandatory” deliverables.	All deliverables are “mandatory” deliverables.
68	3.3.7.2	63	Confirm if integration with GIS Feeder Portal (MoHUA) requires specific XML/JSON structure.	Strictly as per RfP.
69	3.1	44	Request for clarification regarding the availability status of the drone images and base layers for all towns. (a) whether these drone images are already procured and ready for immediate use by the selected consultant, or (b) procurement is still pending. In the event that the drone imagery is not yet available, please confirm that the Local Self Government Department (Planning) will be responsible for carrying out the drone survey and providing the processed outputs, as the absence of such data will significantly impact the financial bid, methodology, and project timelines.	The drone images and base layers are being received from Survey of India and the client expects that all will be available as per the schedule of delivery for the respective consultants. As per the RfP, the client has to provide Orthorectified Drone Images and feature extracted base layers of Mapping area as part of task1 stage III. (Refer Clause 3.3.3.1). Also refer provisions under Note to Table 12 of RfP.
70	3.1	44	Request for clarification on the current status and	SANKALAN Mobile app issued by MoHUA is



Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p>readiness of the MoHUA provided ‘Integrated Mobile Application’ intended for spatial attribute data collection and vetting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kindly confirm whether this application is already operational and available for use.</li> <li>• If the application is not yet available, request for confirmation that the Client will permit the use of traditional/standard data collection methodologies commonly adopted in master plan preparation.</li> </ul>	<p>now functional. The corresponding link is <a href="https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/">https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/</a></p> <p>Also refer Clause 3.3.3.1(11) of RfP.</p>
71	3.3.3 Task 1 (7)	52	<p>We seek the following clarifications regarding manpower and support requirements to be provided to the District Town Planner for vetting activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kindly confirm whether the consultant is permitted to deploy in house team members for this activity.</li> <li>• Request clarity on the number of personnel required by the Client for field vetting support.</li> <li>• Request clarity on the experience level / qualification expected for such personnel.</li> <li>• In case external manpower (beyond in house team) is required, the RFP does not specify the quantum, duration, or skill level, making it difficult to account for these costs in the financial proposal.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, request that such manpower related expenses be considered on a reimbursement basis or</p>	<p>Strictly as per Section 3.3.3, Task 1 (7).</p> <p>Also refer to Clause 6.1 &amp; 6.3 under General conditions of Contract in Section 6 of RfP.</p>

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			quantified by the Client, instead of requiring bidders to include undefined costs in the financial bid.	
72	3.8.2	74	Request for clarification on whether the Client will permit establishment of one common local office at a strategically suitable location between the two districts, provided it ensures convenient and efficient access to both the District Town Planner offices and the project towns.	See Amendment No. 11 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
73	3.7.1	72	<p>Request the Client to kindly reconsider the staffing structure proposed for the Team Leader role. The suggestions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Senior Urban Planner (10+ years' experience) as an additional Key Professional, deployed full time at the project location, responsible for day-to-day coordination and field-level management.</li> <li>• The Team Leader/Senior Planner may be engaged at 50% input, providing strategic guidance, quality assurance, and periodic reviews, and travelling to site as and when required.</li> <li>• This arrangement ensures continuous on-ground coordination while allowing the Team Leader to effectively manage multiple high-level responsibilities across towns.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, request the Client to modify the clause to permit this practical staffing structure.</p>	See Amendment No. 6, 7 & 13 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum. Other aspects strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
74	2.8.1 (3)	26	Request to increase average annual turnover from Rs. 5 Cr to Rs. 20 – 50 Cr.	Strictly as per RfP
75	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (i)]	28	More than 180 Sq. Km but Less than 200 Sq. Km = 1 Marks More Than 200 Sq. Km but Less than 250 Sq. Km = 2 Marks More Than 250 Sq. Km but Less than 300 Sq. Km = 3 Marks	Strictly as per RfP
76	2.8.2.1	29	Request to permit 1 project carrying the full 3 marks, instead of mandating 3 separate assignments. Many large, comprehensive assignments cover extensive scope equivalent to multiple smaller works.	Strictly as per RfP
77	2.8.2.1	29	Request that the evaluation allow 1 completed GIS project to carry all 3 marks, considering that extensive GIS assignments typically cover multiple towns/ULBs and are equivalent to 3 separate works.	Strictly as per RfP
78	2.8.2.1	29	Request to allow 1 completed project to be awarded 3 marks, as large-scale EMP/EIA and township planning projects often have a broad scope comparable to 3 individual assignments.	Strictly as per RfP
79	Table 10 Sl. No. 16	39	Urban Designer -Two (1each for 2 Towns) Infrastructure Specialist/ Transport Planner - Two (1each for 2 Towns)	Strictly as per RfP. Also refer clause 3.7.3 of RfP.
80	2.8.2.1 Table 4	20	Request to include an Annual Turnover–based evaluation criterion in Table 4. Suggested marking	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p>pattern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ₹5 crore – 3 marks</li> <li>• ₹5–10 crore – 5 marks</li> <li>• ₹10–20 crore – 7 marks</li> <li>• Above ₹20 crore – 10 marks</li> </ul>	
81	2.3.1	10	It is suggested that the weightage of Technical and Financial Proposal to be 80: 20 i.e. 80% weightage to ST and 20% weightage to SF.	Strictly as per RfP
82	2.8.1 (4)	20	Request to increase experience to minimum of 20 years in consultancy services and in case of JV, the lead member's experience to minimum 15 years and that of JV member to minimum 10 years in consultancy services.	Strictly as per RfP
83	Table 7	26	This will require additional 6 years of experience for Senior Planner, GIS Expert and Senior Transport Planner which summarizes extensive experienced experts to be deployed which also might draw undesirable high costing for the man month inputs. It is suggested to consider additional experience – 1 mark for every 1 year of additional experience with maximum 3 marks.	Strictly as per RfP
84	Table 9	28	Is the report submission meant for the presentation or along with the Proposal?	No copy of presentation to be submitted along with technical bid. However, report to be submitted along with the bid as enclosure for <b>TP Form 5D</b>

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
85	2.8.6.2 (c)	33	We request you to allow us to submit insurance bond of the same value instead of bank guarantee in line with the IRDAI guidelines.	Strictly as per RfP
86	Table 10 Sl. No 18	40	We understand that the local office space shall be required for coordination purpose while consultant team can work from their respective offices and shall be available for meetings and / or discussions with the client whenever required.	Strictly as per RfP. Also refer Clause 3.8
87	3.3.3	52	Confirm whether the creation of Geo-Database is within the scope of the consultant or the consultant's scope is limited to only collection/updation.  This Clarity is important as The AMRUT 2.0 specifies an additional costing for the 'Creation of Geo-Database'.	Ground Truthing and Value addition is included in the scope of work. Refer clause 3.3.3.1 of RfP and Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020" by MoHUA, GoI.
88	2.8.3	29	Confirm whether the consultancy fees should also include the costing of 'Creation of Geo-database' in the Financial Proposal in addition to the costing of 'Preparation of Master Plan' as specified in AMRUT 2.0. Also, Request to provide ceiling limit of such geo database creation.	Costing of Consultancy service also includes cost for Ground Truthing and Value addition. Refer clause 3.3.3.1 of RfP.
89	3.3.6.1 Stage II	54	To better align with the client's requirement, request to specify any additional surveys that needs to be conducted by the consultant, so all bidders are at par in bidding purposes.	Town-wise List of Other surveys required to be carried out by the consultant as per clause 3.3.2.3 (Task 3 of Stage II) is enclosed as Annexure IV to this Corrigendum.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			If no such requirements, request to delete 'other surveys'	Land use survey and attribute data collection, Socio-economic survey, Traffic and transportation survey and Risk assessment survey are mandatory. Apart from these surveys, other surveys as listed in the Clause 3.1.2.2 shall be done.
90	3.3.2.2 Task 2	56	We understand that the 'Integrated Mobile Application' will be made available to the consultant by the client at NO Additional Cost.	SANKALAN Mobile app issued by MoHUA is now functional. It can be downloaded from Play Store in android devices at free of cost. The corresponding link is <a href="https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/">https://amrut.iirs.gov.in/</a>
91	3.3.2.3 Task 3	56	Specify what exactly is expected out of the following surveys: Tourism survey, Migrant labourers survey, Street vending survey, Commercial survey, Industries Survey.	For surveys addressing <b>target population groups</b> (e.g., migrant labourers), primary questionnaire-based sample surveys shall be undertaken where such population groups are really significant in the planning area, identified as essential for Master Plan formulation and where secondary data is demonstrably inadequate or unavailable. For surveys addressing <b>location/sector-specific subjects</b> (tourism, heritage, urban design, street vending, commercial, industries, etc.), subsequent to secondary data studies and consultations, the Consultant shall undertake reconnaissance survey and field observations to identify, map and document such areas. Sample-

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
				<p>based primary questionnaire surveys may be conducted in these identified areas where the reconnaissance survey reveals any complexities or functional details essential for plan formulation.</p> <p>All survey data collected shall be systematically organized into a comprehensive database, integrated with secondary data sources, and utilized for analysis and preparation of Master Plan proposals and policies.</p>
92	3.3.2.4 Task 4	57	Clarify & specify the role of consultant in ‘Review of Detailed Town Planning Schemes if any in force in the Town and assessing the need for any revision/revocation’	As per amendments to section 50 of the Kerala Town and Country Planning Act 2016, if it deemed necessary, a sanctioned Detailed Town Planning Scheme may be revoked by a Master Plan published and sanctioned in accordance with the provisions of this Act. In such cases, proposals in the existing sanctioned Detailed Town Planning Scheme shall be specifically reviewed and suitably addressed in the master Plan stating clearly the reasons thereof. Hence this task is to be carried out in consultation with/as per suggestions of the Town Planner.
93	3.3.6.1 Task 1	67	Clarify the term ‘Module Maps- (MP/02)’.	Module Maps are part-maps of proposed landuse map (PLU Map) drawn to a larger(enlarged) scale to improve readability. This is found




Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
				required, when the PLU Map of the town prepared in even the largest sheet size (eg: A0) cannot ensure readability and hence necessitates preparation of Part-Maps in larger scale (village wise, Grid-wise or otherwise). Wherever Module maps are found necessary at draft Master Plan (publication) stage, they will also be required at Final Master Plan (sanctioning) Stage.
94	3.3.6.3 Task 3	68	We understand that consultant's scope of work is limited to the preparation of master plan for the town as a whole and NO additional detailed map is expected for each ward. Kindly confirm.	Master Plan is to be prepared for the town as a whole. No further ward wise detailing of the proposed Landuse map is expected. However, the extract of Proposed Landuse (PLU) map pertaining to each ward may be required for ward level consultation.
95	Section 6 2.5.3	130	Request to incorporate the wordings "Extension due to any reasons not attributable to the Bidder and which is beyond the control of the Bidder" in the provision as consultant should have EOT right on reasons not attributable to it.  Request to have a mutual agreed price escalation in case of EOT due to reasons not attributable to the Consultant. Please consider.	Strictly as per RfP. Refer to the note to Table 12 of Section 3. Also refer Clause 6.1 & 6.3 under General conditions of Contract in Section 6 of RfP.
96	Section 6	131	Performance security is rendered for non-performance related issues in the contract and not for any other	Strictly as per RfP



Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
	2.6.2		events present in the contract, like breach, LDs or in the event of termination of the contract. Also, disqualifying the company/partnership/consortium members indefinitely would be unfair to the consultant. Therefore, we request deletion of this clause.	
97	Section 6 2.6.3	132	The Clause stipulates that <i>“The payments made to the Consultants prior to the effective date of termination shall be deemed to fully discharge the Client’s obligation under this Contract. The Consultant hereby expressly waives any right to raise claims or disputes in relation to such termination”</i> . Request for deletion of the last sentence of the above given provision.	Strictly as per RfP
98	Section 6 2.6.4	132	The Clause stipulates that <i>“In the event of non-payment by the Consultant within the stipulated period, the Client shall be entitled to realise the said amount from any one or more of the following sources, without further notice: a) The Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) and/or Performance Guarantee furnished by the Consultant; b) Any other dues or payments from the Client or from any department or agency of the Government of Kerala to the Consultant; c) By initiating appropriate legal proceedings, including but not limited to, the institution of a civil suit for recovery. This clause shall survive the termination of the</i>	Strictly as per RfP

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			<p><i>Contract and shall remain enforceable notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained elsewhere in the Contract”.</i></p> <p>Request for deletion of the last sentence of the above given provision.</p>	
99	Section 6 3.2.2	134	Request for deletion of the words " <i>after the termination</i> ".	Strictly as per RfP
100	Section 6 3.4	141	We can share the insurance certificate covering all the risks as specifically required under the insurance provisions and that certificate can be reviewed by the Client. Furthermore, the insurance certificate serves as evidence that the Consultant has obtained and maintained the necessary insurance coverage. We believe this should suffice as adequate proof. Kindly confirm on this.	Yes
101	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (i)]	22	Request to consider revising the technical-evaluation criteria and remove the restrictive requirement related to Local Area Plans, Detailed Town Planning Schemes, Town Planning Schemes, and Land-Pooling Schemes and may add Zonal Development plan or City development plan which are a bit similar to this.	See Amendment No. 3 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
102	2.8.2	23	Confirm whether experience in which the scope of work included financial management, revenue-generation modelling, and related analyses	Strictly as per RfP, Refer Clause 2.8.2.1, Table 4, Sl.No.1(b)(iii)

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			can be considered equivalent to the criteria mentioned.	
103	2.8.1	20	Request to revise that the turnover be derived solely from consulting services (excluding revenue from software sales, drone services, etc.).	Strictly as per RfP
104	2.8.2.1 TP Form: 5B (II)	98	Request to delete this clause from the submission as size of proposal will be huge and the quantum of the submission is too large while enclosing copies of Existing Landuse map, Proposed Landuse map and Development Controls / zoning Regulations pertaining to planning area.	Strictly as per RfP. For technical issues related to uploading of Documents, refer Clause 2.7.2
105	2.8.3	29	<p>The BoQ sheet provided along with the RFP has the following cells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cell No. M 11: including GST and other taxes and charges</li> <li>Cell No. BA 11: Total Amount without taxes</li> <li>Cell No. BB 11: Total Amount with taxes</li> </ul> <p>When the figure is entered in M11, all the three cells are Automatically showing the same amount. Consultant cannot edit in cell BA11 and BB11.</p> <p>Request to rectify this discrepancy.</p>	<p>All Bidders are hereby informed that <b>Column No. 53 titled “TOTAL AMOUNT Without Taxes” in the BoQ (Financial Proposal) is to be treated as redundant and inoperative.</b></p> <p>Any <b>figures/values that are auto-generated or populated in Column No. 53</b> on the basis of entries made by the bidder in Column No. 13 shall be ignored and <b>shall not be taken into account</b> for the purpose of evaluation of the financial Proposal as well as in finalising the contract value.</p> <p><b>Column No. 53 shall stand null and void</b> and figures/values (that are auto-generated or</p>

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification																																				
	Clause No.	Page No.																																						
			<table><tr><th>NUMBER #</th><th>NUMBER #</th><th>NUMBER #</th><th>TEXT #</th></tr><tr><td>(including GST &amp; Other taxes and Charges) In <b>Figures</b> To be entered by the Bidder Rs. P</td><td>TOTAL AMOUNT Without Taxes</td><td>TOTAL AMOUNT With Taxes</td><td>TOTAL AMOUNT In Words</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>55</td></tr><tr><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>INR Ten Thousand Only</td></tr><tr><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>INR Ten Thousand Only</td></tr><tr><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>INR Ten Thousand Only</td></tr><tr><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>10000.000</td><td>INR Ten Thousand Only</td></tr><tr><td></td><td> 40000.000</td><td>40000.000</td><td>INR Forty Thousand Only</td></tr><tr><td colspan="4">INR Forty Thousand Only</td></tr></table>	NUMBER #	NUMBER #	NUMBER #	TEXT #	(including GST & Other taxes and Charges) In <b>Figures</b> To be entered by the Bidder Rs. P	TOTAL AMOUNT Without Taxes	TOTAL AMOUNT With Taxes	TOTAL AMOUNT In Words	13	53	54	55	10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only	10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only	10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only	10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only		 40000.000	40000.000	INR Forty Thousand Only	INR Forty Thousand Only				populated as the case may be) in other columns shall stand valid.
NUMBER #	NUMBER #	NUMBER #	TEXT #																																					
(including GST & Other taxes and Charges) In <b>Figures</b> To be entered by the Bidder Rs. P	TOTAL AMOUNT Without Taxes	TOTAL AMOUNT With Taxes	TOTAL AMOUNT In Words																																					
13	53	54	55																																					
10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only																																					
10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only																																					
10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only																																					
10000.000	10000.000	10000.000	INR Ten Thousand Only																																					
	 40000.000	40000.000	INR Forty Thousand Only																																					
INR Forty Thousand Only																																								
106	3.1.2.1	44	Request for providing the aerial images and base map layers to the successful bidders before submission of the inception report to enable them to review and submit their observations as part of the inception report and to make necessary measures to address the issues of the layers and images by the consultants and client.	Strictly as per RfP																																				
107	2.8.1 Table 3	20	Whether bidders with an average annual turnover of at least ₹12 crores in the last three consecutive financial years will be considered.	Yes. Strictly as per RfP.																																				
108	2.8.1 Table 3	20	Whether Zonal Development Plans, where the scope of work is equivalent to that required for this Master Plan, will be considered for meeting this eligibility criterion.	No. Strictly as per RfP																																				

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
109	3.8	75	Confirm whether the Team Leader may be permitted to coordinate work remotely, with regular visits to the office and attendance at all important meetings as required.	Strictly as per RfP.
110	3.2	46	Clarification on whether town-specific geo-databases will be provided in a standardized schema (e.g., MoHUA AMRUT 2.0 formats) and whether data gaps (if any) will be filled by the Consultant or the Client.	Town specific Orthorectified Drone Images and feature extracted layers such as Roads, building footprints, waterbodies etc. as received from SoI (one sample shown in the pre-bid meeting) will be provided by Client to the Consultant after execution of Contract as per RfP. Ground Truthing and Value addition is included in the scope of work of Consultant. Refer clause 3.3.3.1 of RfP and “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
111	3.3 Stage 1	46–47	If discrepancies, gaps, or processing delays occur while using the supplied imagery (e.g., missing tiles, partial coverage, misalignment with cadastral layers), will the Client grant additional time for rectification/processing	Strictly as per RfP.
112	3.3	46–48	Clarification on whether there is a prescribed ELU classification system mandated by Kerala TCP Act or AMRUT 2.0, or if the Consultant may propose a standardized classification aligned with MoHUA norms.	For ELU classification refer “Design and Standards for application of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
113	3.3.3.1	52	Confirm whether digitized cadastral maps will include parcel boundaries.	No. Cadastral maps will be provided as scanned copy/hard copy. Wherever GIS format (shapefiles) are available with the client, they will also be shared.
114	3.3	53–54	Clarification on whether CRZ maps, flood hazard maps, and environmental sensitivity layers will be provided by relevant departments, or if the Consultant must procure, process, and validate these independently.	CRZ maps, hazard maps from KSDMA as available will be provided in .pdf format. Wherever GIS format (shapefiles) are available with the client, they will be also be shared
115	Section 3	46	Will the client facilitate the end-to-end coordination with SoI/KSDMA to obtain datasets?	Yes
116	2.8.2.1 [1(b) (i)]	22	Request to accept a Contract Agreement, Work Order, or an ongoing project certificate as valid proof for specific experience requirement or provide relaxation by allowing at least one completed project to be considered sufficient for eligibility.	Strictly as per RfP.
117	2.8.2.2	24	Request to consider corporate members of the Institute of Town Planners, India (ITPI) as eligible qualification for Senior Planner and Junior Planner positions.	See Amendment No. 6, 7 & 13 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
118	2.8.2.1	23	Request to consider PMC and PMU experience under the Smart City Mission under clause I(b) (iii).	Strictly as per RfP
119	2.8.2.1 Table 4	21	Request to allow marking the same eligible projects under multiple applicable forms of Form 5B.	Strictly as per RfP.
120	2.8.2.1	23	Financial management and property tax components included in the same project—should they be	Strictly as per RfP.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			uploaded separately under Form 5B(iii) and Form 5B(iv)?	
121	2.8.2.1	22	Clarification on whether additional master plans specified in 1(a) can be added under Clause 1(b).	Under clause 2.8.2.1, against SI No 1(b)(ii) of Table 4, additional Master Plans satisfying the respective criteria can be added.
122	2.8.2.2	23	Request to change the number of support professionals to one GIS professional and one Junior Planner, instead of two persons for each cluster.	Strictly as per RfP.
123	2.8.2.1	21	In states like Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, common zoning regulations exist for the whole state. Can such documents be accepted under Clause 2.8.2 “Evaluation of Technical Proposal”?	Yes, in such cases the bidder shall upload such common regulations including the Government order/Notification in that regard.
124	2.8.2.1	21, 22	In states like Uttar Pradesh, zoning regulations are available only in Hindi. Can we upload the document in the same language or provide the official site link, as translating the entire document within the limited period is difficult? Alternatively, can a completion certificate be considered?	Strictly as per RfP.
125	2.8.2.1	23	Request to consider private township projects under environmental plans and related studies under I(b)(v).	See Amendment No. 4 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum. Works satisfying the criteria can be submitted in <b>TP Form: 5B(V)</b> prescribed in Section 5 of RfP.
126			Request for a right to terminate in the event of non-payment, delayed payment or breach of obligation by the Client as per RfP/contract. Kindly consider.	Strictly as per RfP.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
127			<p>Request for the inclusion of the following language in the RfP to address the consultant's liability, including a clear cap and specified exclusions:</p> <p>“The Consultant’s total liability under this agreement [except in case of gross negligence or wilful misconduct on the part of the Consultant or on the part of any person acting on behalf of the Consultant in carrying out the Services] for any direct loss accrued due to deficiency in Services rendered by it, shall not be higher than the total professional fees of the consultant under this agreement. Neither Party shall under any circumstances be liable to the other Party for any consequential, special or indirect losses and/or any and all loss of production, loss of use, loss of efficiency, claims by the Client’s suppliers, contractors or customers, loss of revenue, loss of profit and any similar losses; that arise from or in connection with this agreement.”</p>	Strictly as per RfP
128			Clarification on whether GoI funds for this sub-scheme under AMRUT 2.0 have already been sanctioned.	Refer Clause 9.6.1 of AMRUT 2.0 Reforms Agenda issued by MoHUA in August 2022 and Clause 3.4.1 of RfP.
129			Request to provide all available data to the consultant at the time of agreement itself, as it will help in checking the quality and completeness of the data.	Relevant Data available with the Client will be made available to the Consultant after issue of work order.
130			Clarification on whether the base layers follow	Yes. Refer “Design and Standards for application



Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
			AMRUT 2.0 GIS guidelines.	of Drone/UAV technology, Oct 2020” by MoHUA, GoI.
131			Suggestion to consider both financial and technical qualifications together instead of checking only the financial qualification of the lead member in a JV. If the JV lead member has financial capacity but no planning experience, it may affect the project if the lead member is rejected at any stage.	Strictly as per RfP
132			Clarification on whether Web-GIS experience is mandatory for the consultant.	Strictly as per RfP
133			Clarification on whether separate projects are needed to qualify for different clusters.	No
134			Since the AMRUT 2.0 mission ends in March 2026, is there any initiative from the State Government regarding the management of funds if the mission ends?	The Client expects that sub-scheme for preparation of GIS based Master Plan under AMRUT 2.0 may be extended further.
135			Clarification on whether a consolidated list of water bodies within the municipal area is available.	No consolidated list of water bodies of all towns are available with the Client.
136			Clarification on whether flooded area data falls under AMRUT 2.0 and whether the GIS data format is available.	hazard maps from KSDMA as available will be provided in .pdf format. Wherever GIS format (shapefiles) are available with the client, they will be also be shared
137			Clarification on whether payment will be released from the District Office or the Chief Town Planner’s Office.	As per SNA SPARSH fund flow mechanism.

Sl. No	Reference to Existing RfP		Suggestion/Query/Request raised for Clarification / modification on RfP provisions	Decision/Clarification
	Clause No.	Page No.		
138			Clarification on whether the performance guarantee is required town-wise or whether one agreement and one guarantee is sufficient for all clusters.	Performance Guarantee shall be required town wise. See Amendment No. 8 & 9 in Annexure - I to this corrigendum
139			Clarification on whether the bidder needs to submit the presentation along with the bid.	No. See “Enclosures Required” and “Declaration” under TP Form: 5D.
140			An indicative map showing location of towns under AMARUT 2.0 sub-scheme in the state	Enclosed as Annexure – V to this corrigendum
141			Summary of Amendments to RfP after Pre-Bid meeting held on 20.11/2025.	Enclosed as Annexure – I to this corrigendum

Sd/-  
**Chief Town Planner (Planning)**  
**LSGD Planning**  
**Government of Kerala**

## ANNEXURE – I

### AMENDMENTS TO RFP

1. *Item (1) of Clause 2.2.8 is substituted as follows:*

“The bidder shall be a legally established and registered entity under applicable Indian laws, holding valid registration. Eligible bidding entities include: (i) A Company incorporated under the Indian Companies Act, 2013 (including Private Limited and Public Limited Companies); (ii) A Not-for-Profit Company incorporated under Section 8 of the Indian Companies Act, 2013 (iii) A Partnership Firm registered under The Indian Partnership Act, 1932; (iv) A Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) incorporated under the Limited Liability Partnership Act, 2008; (v) A Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 or applicable state laws; (vi) A Cooperative Society registered under applicable state cooperative societies Acts; (vii) A Consortium / Joint Venture of entities listed in sub-clauses (i) to (vi) above, subject to conditions. The bidder shall not have been barred / blacklisted by the Central Government, any State Government, any statutory authority or any public sector undertaking, as the case may be, from participating in any project for the last 5 years. No such bar shall subsist as on the date of the Proposal.”

2. *Clause 2.7.5 of RfP is substituted as follows:*

“2.7.5 Tender Document Fees and Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)

(1) The Bidder shall pay; a tender document fees of Rs. 9757/- and Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) of Rs 1,00,000/- The EMD is required to protect the client against risk of Bidder’s conduct, which would warrant the forfeiture of security.

(2) Tender document fee and EMD Exemption:

(a) In accordance with the applicable Government of Kerala orders on MSME support and public procurement, all the MSMEs with valid Udyam/Udyog Aadhaar Registration or any other body specified by the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises working within the State of Kerala will be exempted from payment of tender document fee and Earnest Money Deposit (EMD). However, Adhoc Consortium/ JV with such firm(s) is not eligible for such exemption.

(b) MSME bidders claiming exemption from payment of Tender document Fee and EMD shall submit corresponding valid Registration documents (valid on bid submission date) as stipulated in (a) above.”

3. *In Clause 2.8.2.1 Table 4, against Sl No 1(b)(i) in second Column, the words “/Zonal Development Plan” is included after the words “Land Pooling Schemes”.*

*[Experience in preparation of Zonal Development Plans and satisfying the criteria (excluding the works specified in Sl No: 1(a) of Table 4 of RfP) can be submitted in TP Form: 5B(I) prescribed in Section 5 of RfP.]*

4. *In Clause 2.8.2.1 Item 1(b)(v) of Table 4, the words “or similar planning projects” is substituted with words “other planning assignments”.*
5. *After Table 4 in Clause 2.8.2.1 of RfP, the following Note is added at the end:*

*“Note: In the case of JV/Consortium, the works undertaken by any of the firms in JV/Consortium can be considered as the works undertaken by the bidder.”*

6. *In Table 5 of Clause 2.8.2.2 [A] of RfP, Qualifications & Experience of Senior Planner is modified as below:*

*“Master’s degree in Planning / valid corporate membership of Institute of Town Planners India (AITP/FITP) and at least 15 years’ experience in Planning.”*

7. *In Clause 2.8.2.2 [C], under Table 7, the following note is added:*

*“Note:- In the case of the Key Professional: Senior Planner, valid Corporate membership of ITPI (AITP/FITP) shall also be considered under Mandatory educational qualifications. In such cases, valid Certificate of such Membership shall be included along with duly filled TP Form 5C(I) along with other enclosures.”*

8. *In Clause 2.8.6.1, the words ‘separately for each town’ is included in the third sentence after the words ‘The successful bidder shall provide performance guarantee’. The amended clause is as follows;*

*“2.8.6.1 After Negotiations, the Client will submit the process of selection of successful bidder before the CERC. On approval by CERC, the Chief Town Planner will issue letter of acceptance/selection notice town-wise to the successful bidder. The decision of the tender accepting authority shall be final. The successful bidder shall provide performance guarantee separately for each town as detailed in clause 2.8.6.2, power of attorney of authorised signatory in original and resumes along with documents in support of qualification and experience of the Support Professionals to the District Town Planner, so that the agreement shall be executed with the District Town Planner concerned, separately for each town*

within 15 working days from the date of issue of LoA/selection notice. Agreement proper may be executed on non-judicial stamp paper of appropriate value as per the prevailing laws of the State of Kerala. Subsequently, work order shall be issued by District Town Planner town-wise to Consultant preferably within 10 working days of execution of agreement. (Also see clauses 3.7.2, 3.8).”

9. *In clause 2.8.6.2 of RfP, the first sentence is substituted as follows:*

“ The Consultant will have to provide a **Performance Guarantee of 5% of the contract price for the corresponding town**, prior to the signing of the Agreement as per the following details:....”

10. *In clause 3.7.2.4, the words “local candidates (domicile within Kerala)” shall be substituted with the word “candidates”. All other provisions in this clause of RfP shall prevail.*

11. *Clause 3.8.2 shall be substituted as follows:*

“3.8.2 Such office space shall be stationed in a location within a District where any of the towns for the assignment is awarded. The office space shall be so located so as to reach the office of the District Town Planner and the towns in the cluster in the most convenient / best possible way.”

12. ***PQ FORM 4A PART I** under Section 4 of RfP is substituted with Form given as Annexure II to this Corrigendum.*

13. *Sub item [I] of Item 13 in **TP FORM 5C(I)** under Section 5 of the RfP shall be substituted with the following words:*

“[I] Whether the person holds Master's Degree in Planning or valid Corporate Membership of the Institute of Town Planners India (AITP/FITP) (Yes/No) : .....”

14. *Information regarding **BoQ** to all Bidders:-*

All Bidders are hereby informed that **Column No. 53 titled “TOTAL AMOUNT Without Taxes” in the BoQ (Financial Proposal) is to be treated as redundant and inoperative. Any figures/values that are auto generated or populated in Column No. 53** on the basis of entries made by the bidder in Column No. 13 **shall be ignored and shall not be taken into account** for the purpose of evaluation of the financial Proposal as well as in finalising the contract value.

**Column No. 53 shall stand null and void** and figures/values (that are auto generated or populated as the case may be) in other columns shall stand valid.

## ANNEXURE – II

### PQ FORM: 4A PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION

*[Refer Clause 2.8.1, Table 3, Sl. No: 1, 2]*

- 1. (a) Name of the consulting firm (“Lead Member” in the case of JV/consortium):**

---

- (b) Type of Firm** *(Write whether Public Ltd Company/Private Ltd Company/ Not-for-Profit company/ Partnership firm/Limited Liability Partnership (LLP)/ Society/ Cooperative Society):*

---

- (c) In the case of JV / Consortium, name of other member (“consortium member”) of the JV / Consortium and the type of such firm** *(if not applicable write “NA”. If applicable, write whether Public Ltd Company/Private Ltd Company/ Not-for-Profit company/Partnership firm/Limited Liability Partnership (LLP)/ Society/ Coop. Society):*

---

- 2. In case the consulting firm is a subsidiary of a larger organisation, Name of the parent organisation** *(Write NA if not applicable. In the case of JV/consortium, write the information regarding Lead member first & Consortium member second):*

---

---

- 3. Consulting firm’s registered address in India** *(If JV/consortium, write the address of Lead member in column 1 & Consortium member in column 2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

4. **PAN of the Consulting firm** *(If JV/consortium, write the PAN of Lead member in column-1 & Consortium member in column-2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

5. **GST Number of the Consulting firm** *(If JV/consortium, write GST No. of Lead member in column-1 & Consortium member in column-2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

6. **CIN (for companies) / LLPIN (for LLP) / Partnership Registration No: (for Partnership)/ Society Registration Number** issued by State Registrar of Societies (for societies) / **Cooperative Registration Number** issued by Central/State Registrar of Cooperative Societies (for Cooperative Societies) *(If JV/consortium, write the number corresponding to Lead member in column-1 & that of Consortium member in column-2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

7. **TAN of the Consulting Firm:**

*(If JV/consortium, write the number corresponding to Lead member in column-1 & that of Consortium member in column-2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

8. **TIN of the Consulting Firm** (if applicable):

*(If JV/consortium, write the number corresponding to Lead member in column-1 & that of Consortium member in column-2. If not JV/Consortium, write in column 1):*

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

9. **Consulting firm's address for correspondence regarding this tender and assignment, including phone numbers (mention city code) and email addresses:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone/Mobile No: with code: \_\_\_\_\_

**10. If the firm is a JV/Consortium:**

(a) Average annual Turn-over of the:

- Lead member : ₹ \_\_\_\_\_ (Refer details in PQ Form 4A Part II for Lead member)
- Consortium Member: ₹ \_\_\_\_\_ (Refer details in PQ Form 4A Part II for Other member)
- Both Members Total: ₹ \_\_\_\_\_ (Sum of the above two amounts)

(b) Share of Average Annual turn-over of the Lead member: \_\_\_\_\_% (Refer item (5) of clause 2.2.9.)

(c)	Whether the bidder enclosed the attested copy of the legally valid MoU/ Agreement/ Power of attorney entered into by and binding on both members of the JV/ consortium <u>duly notarized</u> .		_____ (specify Yes/No)
(d)	If yes, then whether the said document contain the following provisions: (Refer clause 2.2.9)		
	(i)	JV/Consortium shall remain in force and binding for the entire duration of the bidding process, contract negotiation, execution, and until the satisfactory completion of all contractual obligations under the assignment	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(ii)	Whether the roles, responsibilities, and share of work and liabilities of each member are clearly specified.	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(iii)	Designating the Lead Member	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(iv)	Nominating lead member as partner-in-charge and the authorization is evidenced by submitting power of attorney signed by the legally authorized signatories of both the members	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(v)	Authorising lead member to incur liabilities and to receive instructions on the behalf of the JV/consortium, whether jointly or separately	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(vi)	Authorising lead member to carry out entire execution of the contract (including payment) exclusively through the Lead Member	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(vii)	That, the client will only send communication to the lead member, which will be deemed to have been sent to both the JV/consortium members.	_____ (specify Yes/No)



	(viii)	That, any negotiation and / or agreement with the lead member shall be deemed to have been concluded with both the JV/consortium members.	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(ix)	That, both the members of JV/consortium shall be bound by the said communication and all acts / deeds of the lead member	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(x)	That any member of this JV/consortium participating in a bid will not participate again in the same bid as an individual bidder or as a JV/consortium with another partner	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(xi)	Necessary details on intended percentage participation nomination of lead member and division of responsibility to clearly define the work of each member etc.	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(xii)	That, both members of the JV/ consortium shall be jointly and severally liable for the execution of the contract.	_____ (specify Yes/No)
	(xiii)	That, the members of the JV/ Consortium shall maintain the same combination of members, if participating in any bid (for maximum of three clusters) floated for consultancy assignment for the formulation of Master Plans under AMRUT 2.0 sub-scheme in Kerala.	_____ (specify Yes/No)

## 11. Exemption of EMD and Tender document fee

- Are you claiming for Exemption of EMD and Tender document fee as per item (2) of clause 2.7.5: \_\_\_\_\_ (Specify Yes/No)

- If Yes:

- Valid Udyam Reg. /Udyog Aadhaar Number : \_\_\_\_\_
- Ref No: of Other document Produced : \_\_\_\_\_  
(if not Udyam/Udyog)
- Date of Registration : \_\_\_\_\_
- Whether registration covers Service sector : \_\_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)
- Whether valid Reg. Certificate is attached : \_\_\_\_\_ (Yes/No)

**12. Details of the authorized signatory of the consulting firm for communication regarding this tender and assignment**

- Name : \_\_\_\_\_
- Designation : \_\_\_\_\_
- Contact details of the authorized signatory.
  - Office Phone (with STD) No: : \_\_\_\_\_ Extn \_\_\_\_\_
  - Mobile Phone Number : \_\_\_\_\_
  - Email ID : \_\_\_\_\_
- UID / Aadhaar Number : \_\_\_\_\_
- PAN Number : \_\_\_\_\_
- Specimen Signature of the Authorized Signatory (within the box below)

**DECLARATION**

1. We hereby declare that all the Information furnished above, and enclosures provided there under are True to the best of my knowledge and belief.
2. We are claiming exemption of Tender document fee and EMD and declare that we meet all the eligible criteria for exemption of Tender document fee and EMD as stipulated in item (2) of clause 2.7.5 of RfP. *(strike off this para if not claiming exemption of Tender document Fee and EMD)*

***(Signature)***

Name & Title of Authorized Signatory: \_\_\_\_\_

Name & Address of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**13. Enclosures Required** *(all in .pdf format):*

- (1) Notarised Power of Attorney Authorising the Representative of Bidder/Authorised Signatory in the format given in **PQ Form: 4D** (Also see Clause 2.8.1, Table 3, Sl. No:1, item 4)
- (2) Board/executive resolution for (1) above.
- (3) Aadhaar & PAN of such Authorised Signatory.
- (4) Copy of valid Certificate of Incorporation (in the case of Company, LLP) /, Registration of the firm under the relevant legal provision.  
*(Provide documents pertaining to both members; in the case of JV/consortium)*
- (3) Copy of Memorandum & Articles of Association (in the case of companies) / LLP Agreement (in the case of LLP) / Partnership deed (in the case of partnership), Society/Cooperative Bylaw (in the case of Society/Cooperative Societies)  
*(Provide documents pertaining to both members; in the case of JV/consortium)*
- (5) Copy of PAN card *(of both members; in the case of JV/consortium)*
- (6) GST Registration certificate. *(of both members; in the case of JV/consortium)*
- (7) Additional enclosure in the case of JV/consortium: MoU/Agreement/power of attorney entered into by the members of the JV/ consortium duly notarized, (along with intended percentage participation nomination of lead member and division of responsibility to clearly defining the work of each member etc) [Also refer clause 2.2.9]

### ANNEXURE – III

## AMRUT 2.0 TOWNS AND POPULATION ESTIMATE FOR THE YEAR 2025 TO BE USED FOR FIXING SAMPLE SIZE

*(Please refer Sl.No.44 of the Corrigendum)*

Sl No	Cluster	Name of District	Name of ULB	Population in 2025
1	1	Thiruvananthapuram	Nedumangad	77,968
2		Thiruvananthapuram	Neyyattinkara	91,809
3		Kollam	Karunagapally	61,538
4		Kollam	Punalur	60,525
5	2	Pathanamthitta	Thiruvalla	68,537
6		Pathanamthitta	Pandalam	58,964
7		Alappuzha	Kayamkulam	88,950
8		Alappuzha	Cherthala	59,391
9	3	Kottayam	Kottayam	1,79,215
10		Kottayam	Ettumanoor	66,263
11		Kottayam	Changanassery	72,640
12		Idukki	Kattappana	55,269
13		Idukki	Thodupuzha	67,424
14	4	Ernakulam	Thrippunithura	1,19,908
15		Ernakulam	Kalamassery	91,725
16		Ernakulam	Thrikkakkara	85,515
17		Ernakulam	Maradu	57,937
18	5	Thrissur	Kodungalloor	92,332
19		Thrissur	Wadakkancherry	79,498
20		Thrissur	Iringalakuda	78,417
21		Thrissur	Chalakkudy	64,127
22	6	Palakkad	Ottappalam	69,714
23		Palakkad	Shornur	56,413
24		Malappuram	Valancherry	57,590
25		Malappuram	Perinthalmanna	64,441
26	7	Thrissur	Kunnamkulam	70,076
27		Malappuram	Ponnani	1,17,276
28		Malappuram	Tirur	72,652
29		Malappuram	Kottakkal	62,651
30	8	Malappuram	Manjeri	1,25,844
31		Malappuram	Kondotty	76,796
32		Malappuram	Nilambur	60,059
33		Malappuram	Malappuram	82,850

SI No	Cluster	Name of District	Name of ULB	Population in 2025
34	9	Malappuram	Parappananangadi	92,326
35		Malappuram	Tanur	90,116
36		Malappuram	Tirurangadi	73,395
37		Kozhikode	Feroke	70,080
38	10	Kozhikode	Koyilandy	93,220
39		Kozhikode	Koduvally	63,098
40		Wayanad	Mananthavadi	83,000
41		Wayanad	Sultan Bathery	58,860
42	11	Kozhikode	Vadakara	1,04,141
43		Kozhikode	Payyoli	64,113
44		Kannur	Thalassery	1,20,352
45		Kannur	Panoor	74,818
46	12	Kannur	Payyannur	98,105
47		Kannur	Mattannur	61,166
48		Kasaragod	Kanhangad	95,302
49		Kasaragod	Kasaragod	55,462

## ANNEXURE – IV

### LIST OF OTHER PRIMARY SURVEYS

(ALL SURVEYS IN ADDITION TO THE SPATIAL ATTRIBUTE DATA COLLECTION FOR GEODATABASE(INCLUDING LAND USE SURVEY), TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION SURVEY, SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY AND SURVEYS FOR DISASTER RISK ASSESSMENT)

*(See Clause 3.3.2.3(1) of RfP & Sl No.89 of the Corrigendum)*

List of Questionnaire survey (for the target population concerned) to be carried out under “Other Surveys” for each town under AMRUT 2.0 sub-scheme is given in the table below. The study of available secondary data, consultations with resource persons (wherever applicable), identification of localities of concern and reconnaissance survey in such localities shall precede the questionnaire survey, followed by other field observations and their documentation to support findings.

Sl No	Name of District	Name of ULB	Other Primary Survey(s)
1	Thiruvananthapuram	Nedumangad	Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey, Market Survey
2	Thiruvananthapuram	Neyyattinkara	Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey, Market Survey
3	Kollam	Karunagapally	Migrant labourers survey, Street vending survey
4	Kollam	Punalur	Migrant labourers survey, Street vending survey, Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey
5	Pathanamthitta	Thiruvalla	Migrant labourers survey, Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey
6	Pathanamthitta	Pandalam	Migrant labourers survey, Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey
7	Alappuzha	Kayamkulam	Market Survey, Migrant labourers survey
8	Alappuzha	Cherthala	Market Survey
9	Kottayam	Kottayam	Market Survey
10	Kottayam	Ettumanoor	Nil
11	Kottayam	Changanassery	Market Survey
12	Idukki	Kattappana	Tourism survey, Street vending survey
13	Idukki	Thodupuzha	Street vending survey
14	Ernakulam	Thrippunithura	Nil
15	Ernakulam	Kalamassery	Nil
16	Ernakulam	Thrikkakkara	Nil

Sl No	Name of District	Name of ULB	Other Primary Survey(s)
17	Ernakulam	Maradu	Nil
18	Thrissur	Kodungalloor	Tourism survey, Heritage survey, Street vending survey
19	Thrissur	Wadakkancherry	Street vending survey, Industries survey
20	Thrissur	Iringalakuda	Street vending survey
21	Thrissur	Chalakkudy	Street vending survey, Market survey
22	Thrissur	Kunnamkulam	Street vending survey
23	Palakkad	Ottappalam	Nil
24	Palakkad	Shornur	Nil
25	Malappuram	Valancherry	Nil
26	Malappuram	Perinthalmanna	Street vending survey
27	Malappuram	Ponnani	Nil
28	Malappuram	Tirur	Nil
29	Malappuram	Kottakkal	Nil
30	Malappuram	Manjeri	Street vending survey
31	Malappuram	Kondotty	Nil
32	Malappuram	Nilambur	Heritage survey, Tourism survey
33	Malappuram	Malappuram	Street vending survey
34	Malappuram	Parappananangadi	Nil
35	Malappuram	Tanur	Nil
36	Malappuram	Tirurangadi	Nil
37	Kozhikode	Feroke	Heritage survey, Industries survey
38	Kozhikode	Koyilandy	Street vending survey
39	Kozhikode	Koduvally	Market survey
40	Kozhikode	Vadakara	Heritage survey, Street vending survey
41	Kozhikode	Payyoli	Tourism survey
42	Wayanad	Mananthavadi	Tourism survey, Street vending survey, Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey
43	Wayanad	Sultan Bathery	Tourism survey, Street vending survey, Slum/sub-standard housing cluster survey
44	Kannur	Thalassery	Heritage survey, Migrant labourers survey
45	Kannur	Panoor	Migrant labourers survey
46	Kannur	Payyannur	Heritage survey, Migrant labourers survey
47	Kannur	Mattannur	Migrant labourers survey

Sl No	Name of District	Name of ULB	Other Primary Survey(s)
48	Kasaragod	Kanhangad	Migrant labourers survey
49	Kasaragod	Kasaragod	Migrant labourers survey

*Note: In addition to the above list of 'Other Primary Survey(s)', studies/surveys shall also be conducted for each town for location-specific or sector-specific subjects of importance for the town, subsequent to secondary data studies and as directed by the District Town Planner concerned. This shall include reconnaissance survey and field studies to identify, map and document such areas/items, as needed for the subject/ sector concerned as specified under clause 3.3.2.3(1). All such surveys/data collections are expected to be carried out by Stage II and if there is any missing data, by Stage IV [(Refer clause 3.3.2.3(1) and 3.3.4.3(3)].*



# ANNEXURE – V

## MAP OF AMRUT 2.0 TOWNS – CLUSTER-WISE

(Please refer Sl.No.140 of the Corrigendum)

