

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

Reference to RFB/ Main topic	Bidder Question	Clarification
Cover letter, clause 3 World Bank Procurement Regulations	The Regulations were updated in August 2018 and new requirements were added: does the PTD want compliance with the Nov 2017 version or the current version of the Regulations?	"World Bank Procurement Regulations for IPF Borrowers" dated July 2016, revised November 2017 and August 2018 ("Procurement Regulations")
I - Introduction to Bidders <b>Performance Security, p. 27, Clause 46.1</b> Within twenty-eight (28) days of the receipt of the Letter of Acceptance from the Employer, the successful Bidder, if required, shall furnish the Performance Security	From reading through the RfB document we are unclear whether the PTD expects to receive a second bank guarantee at the time of Contract signature from the winning bidder equivalent to 10% of the subsidy amount (in addition to the bank guarantee for 30% of the subsidy). Please clarify.	Both, a general performance security of 10% of subsidy value is required, as well as a bank guarantee for the advance payment at contract signature. Please refer to Amendment 1 of the RFB.
I - Introduction to Bidders <b>Adjudicator, p.28, Clause 47.1</b> If the Bidder disagrees with this Bid, the Bidder should so state in the Bid.	How can the Bidder state in the Bid that he disagrees with this Bid, when (as per ITB 47, Page 34) the Adjudicator will be finalized during contract negotiation?	This is designed to permit a quicker dispute resolution. It should be finalized during contract negotiation.
II - <b>Bid Data Sheet (BDS)</b> p. 30, ITB 1.3 Subsidy payment is to be complete after additional 4 months satisfactory service provision. The universal service contract is for 5 years, with the expectation that service is viable through the subsidy and operators continue to provide service for the length of their license.	What is the consequence if the financial model for a USF area forecasts that the area will not be financially viable from year 6 onwards?	If the business model supplied by the winning Bidder during bidding shows that it is not viable after year 5, PTD may exercise its right to reject a bid, as per Instructions to Bidders (ITB) 39.1
II - <b>Bid Data Sheet (BDS)</b> , p.31, ITB 8.1 Requests for clarification should be received by the Employer no later than: 21 Days before the deadline	If the last date for submitting questions is 21 Days before the deadline for Bid Submission Date, is it correct to assume it to be 15-Jan-2019?  Will there be any 2 <sup>nd</sup> pre-bid meeting to address any new questions, as this is the first of its kind bidding in the country?	Bid submission Deadline is 06 Feb, 2019 such as the clarifications request should be received not later than 16 Jan 2019.  No, there is no 2 <sup>nd</sup> pre-bid meeting.

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

for Bid Submission Date		All clarifications of bid shall be sent in writing to the Employer's address as per ITB 8.1.
PTD shall also hold a Pre-bid meeting		
II - <b>Bid Data Sheet (BDS)</b> , p.31, ITB 12.1 (j) The Bidder shall submit the following additional documents in its Bid: Environmental and Social Management Plan	Regarding submission of ESMP: On Page 63 (it says ESMP " <i>shall be provided prior to site selection and acquisition</i> "). Does that mean ESMP is <u>not</u> to be submitted with the Bid?	Correct, an ESMP is not required at the proposal stage and the bid document has been amended accordingly.
II - <b>Bid Data Sheet (BDS)</b> , p.31, ITB 15.3 (ii) The bidder(s) must .... provide an estimate of the number of subscribers it expects to serve.	Would the bidder be held accountable if the estimated number of subscribers is not reached? It is obvious that the bidder would strive for the maximum number in order to improve his own revenues. Also acquiring/serving subscribers will be an on-going process that will continue for the whole of 5 years, and beyond.	The bidder will not be held accountable for the number of subscribers; only for continuation of service provision for the USF contract period.
IV – Bidding Forms, <b>Activity Schedule</b> , p.48, clause 3 The form asks for the quantities of each equipment	If, whilst executing the project, the NTL discovers that it needs a smaller quantity of an equipment(s) (e.g. towers) to provide full coverage, what happens? Would the subsidy payment be deducted accordingly? If yes, by what amount or by what calculation?	The USF subsidy contract is for a fixed amount. While being required to show quantities in the proposal, there will be no subsidy recovery if installed quantities change; the subsidy remains fixed. The primary requirement is the provision of specified coverage and QoS.
Annex C - <b>Basic Requirement for Proposals</b> , p.64, clause 4  Proposed retail tariffs for all services	Actual tariffs change regularly; therefore, instead of listing all proposed tariffs in the bid, would it not be better that the bidder gives an undertaking that the retail tariffs shall be "in accordance with prevailing national rates"? This would align with 'Mandatory Services' in 1.5 of Annex E on page 68.  If not, can the bidder meet this requirement by printing copies of all currently available tariff plans and promotions in the market and include them in the bid documentation?	A statement of guarantee that the bidder, if selected, will provide retail tariffs that are identical to prevailing national rates, or less, shall be a sufficient offer and meet the requirements as under Annex C, clause 4.  Please refer to Amendment 1 of the RFB.
p.68 Annex E, 1.5 <b>No Exclusivity</b>	It is assumed that there is an exception here, i.e.: the tower Co., shall not be allowed to invite and contract with other tenants before the first	No, that is not correct. In cases where the Bidder is leasing from a Towerco, the towerco shall be free to contract with other

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

<p>The Service Provider shall not have any exclusive rights to provide the Mandatory Services in the Designated Areas. Where the passive infrastructure is leased from a tower company, the tower company shall be free to invite and contract with other tenants (...).</p>	<p>6-month period (ref: Annex E, 1.1 f) is over. Is that a correct assumption?</p>	<p>tenant(s) from the beginning, with no 6-month reserve period. Only service providers that build and own their towers have the 6 month reserve period.</p>
<p>Annex E, p.71, clause 1.7 (2) Measurement of Coverage signal strength and QoS performance</p>	<p>Experience from other countries demonstrates that the only reliable way to get meaningful and consistent coverage and quality statistics is to get an independent party to apply the same approaches across all USF areas; otherwise there is too much scope for manipulation and argument. The PTD could ask for industry suggestions on the testing methodologies to be applied consistently by the Technical Auditor.</p>	<p>Clause 1.7 (1) does invite Bidders to propose the testing tools and analysis methodology, as well as to negotiate the final methodology during contract negotiation. PTD has also prepared a TOR for a Third Party Technical Auditor to integrate methodologies and therefore to apply a consistent standard to the measurements.</p> <p>Please also refer to Amendment 1 of the RFB.</p>
<p>Section VIII - General Conditions of Contracts (GCC) <b>Force Majeure</b> <b>Definition</b>, p. 83, clause 2.5.2 The failure of a Party to fulfil any of its obligations under the contract shall not be considered to be a breach of, or default under, this Contract insofar as such inability arises from an event of Force Majeure</p>	<p>There are Force Majeure events which reduce the pace of work (eg: due to difficulties in transportation due to landslides etc.), i.e.: events which do not make it <i>impossible</i> or <i>impractical</i> to carry out the work, but which cause delay. Therefore, MPT requests “or delay” be added after “The failure ...”. We have seen this in USF contracts in other countries.</p>	<p>A delay to implementation due to Force Majeure, whether through a period of stoppage or slower implementation, is implicitly covered under the GCC2.5 Force Majeure GCC2.5.1 Definition GCC2.5.2 No Breach of Contract GCC2.5.3 Extension of Time.</p> <p>However, minor landslides are very unlikely to be categorized as Force Majeure events.</p>
<p>Section VIII General Conditions of Contract, <b>Payments</b>, p.84, clause 2.5.4 During the period of their inability to</p>	<p>Who, and how, will the extent of the additional costs be calculated/decided?</p>	<p>The Employer will make a determination if and how payment will be handled in case of a Force Majeure determination, after a request by the Service Provider. The Employer will consider length and severity of any Force Majeure impact to determine if any modification in payment is required. The Service Provider</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

<p>perform the Services as a result of an event of Force Majeure, the Service Provider shall be entitled to continue to be paid under the terms of this Contract, as well as to be reimbursed for additional costs (.....).</p>		<p>may disagree and use the dispute settlement mechanism of the GCC, 8.)</p>
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Termination</b> p.85, clause 2.6.3 In the event that the World Bank suspends the loan or Credit to the Employer ...</p>	<p>The PTD/MoTC has already received USF payments from Telenor and Ooredoo earlier this year and by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 will receive further USF monies from Telenor, Ooredoo and MPT. Any suspension of loan monies from the World Bank should therefore not stop the PTD/MoTC from meeting its USF Pilot contract obligations; monies from the operators should be utilised.</p>	<p>This will be determined by the Employer and the World Bank in the unlikely event of such an occurrence.</p>
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Conflict of Interests</b>, p.86, 3.2.2 The Service Provider agree that, during the term of this Contract and after its termination, the Service Provider and its affiliates, as well as any Subcontractor and any of its affiliates, shall be disqualified from providing goods, works, or Services (other than the Services and any continuation thereof) for any project resulting from or closely related to the Services.</p>	<p>This Section disqualifies a Service Provider from participating in any projects closely related to the project. This would prevent a selected bidder from taking part in later USF projects, outside the pilot project, and should therefore be removed.</p>	<p>No, this is an incorrect statement, this clause does not disqualify a Service Provider from future USF projects; it means the Service provider could not participate in any work from the Employer that is a result of the USF implementation; an example is that a Service Provider could not bid to become the Technical Auditor for the USF project.</p>
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Conflict of Interests</b> p.86, 3.2.3.(b) during the term of this Contract, neither the Service Provider nor their Subcontractors shall hire public employees in active duty or on any type of leave, to perform any activity</p>	<p>MPT seeks confirmation that this clause does not apply to MPTs full-time staff, many of whom are public sector employees</p>	<p>Yes. MPT staff are eligible under the Procurement Regulations.</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

under this Contract		
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Payments of Liquidated Damages</b>, p.87,3.8.1</p> <p>The Service Provider shall pay liquidated damages to the Employer at the rate per day stated in the SCC for each day that the Completion Date is later than the Intended Completion Date....</p>	<p>Would the LDs be calculated based upon the subsidy of the whole lot? Or parts of the lot(s)?</p> <p>Eg: What if only one (1) base station out of, say twenty (20), is delayed and the rest of the lot is ready in time?</p>	<p>The liquidated damages rate is: Three (3%) percent per month, of the subsidy due on payment of milestone, for the specific Lot (see BDS, ITB 15.3) and the specific part of the mandatory service that is delayed.</p> <p>Please see Amendment 1 in this regard.</p>
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Payments of Liquidated Damages</b> p.87, 3.8.2</p> <p>If the Intended Completion Date is extended after liquidated damages have been paid, the Employer shall correct any overpayment of liquidated damages by the Service Provider by adjusting the next payment certificate.</p>	<p>It is common in other markets that LDs are only applied to the whole project end date and not interim stages. However, the wording in 3.8.2 implies the PTD wishes to apply them to each phase payment (milestone). Please clarify.</p> <p>If LDs are to apply to each stage/milestone:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. if only 1 phase payment is late will the amount of LD max out at the subsidy amount for that phase or the whole project?</li> <li>2. if phase 2 is delayed by 3 months and the NTL is charged LDs for that, will the next phase expected completion date be extended by 3 months so that it is not charged LDs a second time for the same delay (anything over a 3 month delay on phase 3 would trigger new LDs)?</li> </ol>	<p>It is important that liquidated damages are also applied to the two milestones of achieving 50% and then 100% coverage, as payments are connected with these milestones. See 3.8.1 (...) "The Employer may deduct liquidated damages from payment due to the Service Provider." (...)</p> <p>Re #1 – Please see Amendment 1 in this regard.</p> <p>Re #1 – Please see Amendment 1 in this regard. Liquidated damages are due for each month of delay.</p>
<p>General Conditions of Contract, <b>Lump-Sum Remuneration</b>, p. 89, 6.1</p> <p>The Service Provider's remuneration shall not exceed the Contract Price and shall be a fixed lump-sum ...</p>	<p>There seems to be a conflict between section 2.5.4 on page 84 and section 6.1 on page 89; the former states that <u>additional</u> monies can be paid during a Force Majeure event whereas the latter states that "the Service Provider's remuneration shall not exceed the Contract Price". Please clarify.</p>	<p>There is no conflict. As per GCC 6.1, the contract will be a lump-sum remuneration contract. No additional payments are foreseen, unless it is determined there is a Force Majeure event (see SCC 2.5.4 re payment for Force Majeure). But even in that case, the Employer also has the option to terminate the contract under certain conditions (see GCC 2.6.1).</p>
<p>Section IX - Special Conditions of Contract, <b>Amendments of, and Supplements</b></p>	<p>We are concerned the amount of liquidated damages (LD) is too high. The World Bank funded project CPB/35/2017 in Mauritius is just 0.1% per day up to a maximum of 5%. Indian USF tender</p>	<p>Liquidated damages are 0.1 % per day or 3% per month. Please see Amendment 1 in this regard: SCC 3.8.1</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

<p><b>to, Clauses in the General Conditions of Contract</b> p.95, 3.8.1</p> <p>The liquidated damages rate is: Employer estimate of the costs of providing the Mandatory Services to the Designated areas but in any case shall not be less than four (4) percent of the subsidy due on payment of milestone that is delayed per month of delay, provided that the total amount of such liquidated damages will not exceed the amount of the subsidy payable to the Service Provider for the provision of the Mandatory Services</p>	<p>USOF/TENDER/NER/30-252-4/2017 stipulates an LD of 2% per site per month up to a maximum of 10%. Pakistan USF tender BSD/Small Lot-P-2/2017 stipulates LDs at 0.5% per week. Finally, as per the Indonesian government’s standard procurement rules, LDs are 0.1% per day up to a maximum of 50 days. Therefore we request the PTD kindly reconsider the rate of LDs and apply a lower rate of 0.5% per week.</p>	
<p>Section IX - Special Conditions of Contract (SCC), <b>p.95,96, clause 6.4</b></p> <p>Advance: Thirty percent (30%) of the Subsidy shall be paid on the contract signature date against the submission of an <b>acceptable subsidy invoice</b></p> <p>Twenty-five percent (25%) of the total Subsidy ..... will be paid against receipt of an acceptable subsidy invoice, GIS map showing the population coverage achieved, and certification by the <b>Technical Auditor...</b></p>	<p>Is there any specific format/content of the “acceptable subsidy invoice”? Could any specimen be shared?</p> <p>Will the Technical Auditor also check/verify that the passive infrastructure is capable of being shared by 2 additional operators?</p>	<p>Refer to SCC6.4. There is no specific format for invoice.</p> <p>Yes, the Technical auditor will check all and any key requirements of the roll-out and service provision.</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

<p>Section IX - Special Conditions of Contract (SCC), p. 97, clause 7.1 The Defects Liability Period is 12 months.</p>	<p>It is unclear what this means in practice. The network will be set up by the successful bidder and operated as well as owned by the same!</p>	<p>The defect liability period is indeed unlikely to be relevant, but the clause shall remain, as civil works will be involved and sometimes there might be some design errors like for example sizing of solar system capacity ( if applicable).</p>
<p>SCC,p.97, clause 7.1 Within 90 days following the Effective Date ....</p>	<p>The document does not define Effective Date; we assume reference should rather be made to 2.1 Effectiveness of Contract on page 82. Please confirm.</p>	<p>The document defines the Effective date in GCC 2.1 (p.82) and SCC 2.1 (p.95). It is the date the contract is signed.</p>
	<p>As per letter, we need to cover 80% population of Villages Track. But in reality, in order to cover villages track, we need to know how many villages are under village track and how much population are distribution on these villages? PTD need to provide this information and GIS map.</p>	<p>Please refer to Addendum 1 of this RFB.</p>
	<p>As per information from letter, they are using GIS map (as digital map calculating method). Our method is more effective than digital map and we have even breakdown for villages level. So should we use our own method?</p>	<p>Bidders may use their own trusted method to propose population coverage, but PTD provides a GIS file including the Worldpop based population distribution across all VTs and requires Bidders to use this file to demonstrate their proposed coverage. Or PTD will require Bidders to submit their coverage map in .SHP format or equivalent in order for PTD to evaluate population coverage against the Worldpop distribution.</p>
	<p>In order to avoid duplicated network planning, PTD need to provide all sites that was on air at those townships.</p>	<p>PTD will not provide site data but suggests that Bidders may coordinate with other operators or on a mutual basis as well as to contact towercos for available site locations.</p>
	<p>Based on max allowable subsidy, we need to know logic behind this. For example, Sidoktaya townships has 37 villages track that has less than 80% to covered population and PTD would like to cover at least 30 villages with &gt;80% population and max subsidy is 1.04 M USD but in Ann there has only 3 villages track to achieve &gt;80% of population and subsidy allow 1.45M. We estimate 17 sites are required</p>	<p>The methodology and assumptions for the subsidy estimation was detailed and shared with operators in at least two workshops and the Pilot Design report prior to this bid. PTD's consultant also explained the BTS and subsidy estimation methodology in detail for the 4 lots during the pre-bid meeting.</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

	<p>to cover Sidokaya village track and 8 sites are required to cover Ann. Reason behind is that uncovered villages track Geography is 3 or 4 times bigger than Ann Geography and we need more site to cover it. We need to consider not only population but also geographical area as well. Hpasawung has high number of uncovered VT and we need to cover Highway as well but subsidy is too less.</p>	
	<p>KPI, CSSR&gt;95%, CCR&gt;93%, CDR&lt;2% / Upload , Download throughput: Target has to be met on average within required coverage boundaries is based on DT result or OSSRC?</p>	<p>For the 50% and 100% completion milestones, the KPIs shall be based on the Drive-out test (DT) results as described in Annex E Clause 1.7 . For the final 4 month performance milestone, PTD may utilize a combination of DT, OSSRC and user surveys, to be determined.</p>
	<p>As per letter, bidder can provide any Technology provide to achieve target KPT and there is no limitation on 2G/3G/4G?</p>	<p>There is no technology limitation except for the requirement to meet the population coverage and QoS specifications of Annex E.</p>
	<p>Spectrum advantage : Since PTD define that bidder has to be use their current spectrum holding, there are some different pointof view. For example, in 900MHZ, most of operator has 7.2MHZ as maximum only and difficult to deploy 3G and 4G together andthey must be use other 2100 or 1800 equipment to deploy 4G. But if operator has 10MHZ on 900band, it is easy to deploy 3G and4G with 900MHZ equipment only and they will get advantage to reduce their capex.</p>	<p>This comment is understood. We believe that you should be able to deploy 3G on 900 MHz to meet current specifications. The requirement for more spectrum resources to deploy 4G in rural areas is to be considered by PTD for future USF areas.</p>
<p>ITB 16 Currencies of Bid and Payment</p>	<p>Is this means , the subsidy payment will be in usd , if the bid amount is submit in usd ?</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct. If the bid is in USD, subsidy payment will be in USD.</p> <p>Please refer to ITB 16.1 and refer to BDS 16.1. The bidder is free to propose <u>up to three foreign currencies</u>.</p> <p>Please also refer to Addendum 1 of this RFB. The requirement to quote local costs in MMK has been removed.</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

ITB 16 Currencies of Bid and Payment	Is the bidder allowed to quote in single foreign currency?	Yes, see above answer to previous question.
ITB 33 Conversion to Single Currency – ITB 33.1	If the bid currency is in employer’s country currency , if there is forex highly depreciated (which is out of control ), is there any compensation plan for that ??	ITB 33.1: the conversion to local currency is only for evaluation purpose only. The payment will be the same as the bid currency.
	Contractual agreement is 5 years , but if the is the situation is leading to highly non-profitable sites (for example ; place is so far, difficult to provide MS, high energy/fuel cost or people move out from villages) after certain period and Operator can’t afford continuous loss - Can Operator appeal for additional subsidy or request to shut down the site? What is USF stand and guidance in such scenario arise later?	The contractual obligation to provide the mandatory services is for 5 years. After that it is the commercial operation of the Service Provider.
	What is the Site continuation guidance beyond 5 years if the Operator find the site(s) as a loss making proposition?	See answer to previous question above.
BDS ITB 1.3 (p.30)	Deadline for site completion is within 12 months . Is there any Force Majeure provision in the event of implementation delay due to external factors e.g. bad weather,site acquisition criticalities, community hindrance? We think 2.5 of the Tender document will be followed prudently and with right set of rationale. Is there any penaltyprovision for delay in implementation? If yes, what is the extend to that and possible exposure?	Refer to p. 83, GCC 2.5 – Force majeure GCC 2.5.1 – Definition GCC2.5.2 – No Breach of Contract GCC2.5.3 – Extension of time  Refer to p. 87, GCC, 3.8 Liquidated Damages
	What level of Government support to be assumed when it comes provide Grid connection in these Township? If not from Day 1, by when Operator can expect get thesites connected with Grid? This is important element for Operator determining the site O&M cost for the period of 5 years and beyond and quote accordingly.	There are no specific plans to provide grid connection to USF sites. PTD has no authority over grid connection.

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

	How Government should support building Distribution network in the difficult to operate geography? What level of Government support Operator can expect finding acapable distribution partner?	There are no plans for any support as this is clearly operator responsibility and core expertise.
	In regards to the Price Adjustment clause 6.6 of the Tender document, a scenario illustration should better help the operator to gauge the implication.	GCC 6.6, SCC 6.6.1 Price Adjustment is not applicable.
	In regards to the Value Engineering clause 2.4.1 of the Tender document, a scenario illustration should better help the operator to gauge the implication.	As per the Special Conditions of Contract (SCC), p. 95, 2.4.1, Value Engineering is not applicable
	Enclosing a format of Pro-forma Financial Statement for each lot seem to be a pre-requisite of bid submission documentation. A format of such Pro-forma Financial Statement e.g. Profit andloss account, Balance Sheet, Cash Flow should be provided by employer.	Refer to Bid Data Sheet (p.31), ITB 15.3 (ii). All requested information should be included as per ITB 15.3. There is no specific format provided for this.
	Minimum number is 3 tenants for tower. Original assumption was max. 2 operator per site, By applying 3 tenant tower solution requires 60% increase cost to tower construction. This area has very small number of pop. That 3 tenants requirements is not realistic yet increase cost significantly.	The selected service provider must ensure that towers are able to accommodate at least <u>one (1)</u> other operator to share the tower. (...)  Please refer to Amendment 1 to this RFB.
	Mnimum latency <300ms eliminate the VSAT option for backhaul which adds cost of building additional tower for repeater sites for Microwave.	Please note that Clause 1.6 of Annex E allows max. 2 secs over satellite

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

	<p>In Hpasawng: Estimated number of BTS from PTD is 4. From our study, minimum required number is 8 due to the terrain blocks in this mountainous area to cover. MPT would like to know how this estimation is made to align with PTD.</p>	<p>The PTD estimation targets 80% population cover in 6 VTs and took the mountainous terrain into consideration. Bidders should be reminded that 80% population coverage per VT will meet the requirement. Note that Annex A is being amended with a corrected list of the VTs in Hpasawng.</p>
	<p>Can we have List of VTs of "Est. no. of VT with less than 80% covered population column"</p>	<p>The list of VTs is provided in the Annex A, in the Table following maps. See the column titled "Approx. % Geog. area covered" – where it is less than 80%. Note that in some cases this estimate may underestimate the current population coverage. Also note that Annex A is being amended with a corrected list of the VTs in Hpasawng.</p>
	<p>Can we have list of " Min. no. of these VTs required to exceed 80% pop'n coverage"</p>	<p>Bidders may themselves select the VTs within the above list which they plan to meet the 80% population coverage requirement.</p>
	<p>Covering 80% of less than 80% Population VTs would require 100% Geo Coverage. Is this PTD's intention?</p>	<p>The RFB requirement is that Bidders must meet the minimum population coverage on an individual VT basis in VTs currently below the specified level.</p> <p>Annex (A) shows all the VTs with less than 80% population coverage and percentage of geographic coverage per VTs.</p>
	<p>Can MPT propose to measure VT coverage method as covering VP with 1km radius from Village Center in MIMU (this method is current method for measuring the license commitment to PTD)?</p>	<p>PTD will not propose specific design solutions. Bidders may utilise any approach which meets the Quality of Service requirements and minimum total population coverage specification per VT required in Annex A and demonstrated by overlay with the GIS Worldpop based population distribution layer as explained in the Pre-Bid Meeting. See also the Amendment to the RFB.</p>

## Clarifications to Bidders Questions

	<p>Can we have entire tower availability around this target region? All existing and planned location by all operators and tower companies.</p>	<p>PTD will not provide site data but suggests that Bidders may coordinate with other operators on a mutual basis as well as to contact towercos for available site locations.</p>
	<p>Mismatch between PTD village tract database and MIMU border database ☐ could PTD provide the border of village in these regions to transparent the information?</p>	<p>Please refer to the Amendment to the RFB.</p> <p>The names of individual villages below the VT administrative level is not available.</p>
	<p>Could PTD provide the exact village location of each village tract (for populated area) that PTD want to ensure the coverage?</p>	<p>The population analysis was conducted using the GIS Worldpop based population distribution and did not identify the names of specific villages, as explained in the Bidders Meeting.</p> <p>Please refer to the Amendment to the RFB.</p>
	<p>Related infrastructure and transmission deployment license, will PTD help us to speed up the process of approval the license for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Optical fiber deployment</li> <li>• From our deployment experiences, many people don't agree Operator to deploy tower ☐ NOC problems ☐ could PTD help us to settle down these case and ease the people if it happens?</li> <li>• Using land of YCDC to deploy tower ☐ is it possible? If possible, will there be any charge or renting fee?</li> <li>• How long PTD can ensure to grant the related license to operator of any kind related to this project?</li> </ul>	<p>PTD will not be able to actively help to facilitate optical fibre or tower deployment.</p>
	<p>Could PTD share the contact point who directly responsible for this?</p>	<p>Bid Data Sheet , ITB 8.1 is the contact person for clarifications of bid purpose.</p>