

TRADING CORPORATION OF PAKISTAN (PVT.) LIMITED

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE | GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN

MODEL TEST PAPER

GENERAL MANAGER (LEGAL)

Computer-Based Testing Format | MCQ Only | Applied Professional Judgment

RFP No. TCP (HR)/14-147/2025-26

Parameter	THIS MODEL PAPER (Illustrative Sample Only)	ACTUAL CBT EXAMINATION (Real Exam Parameters)
Questions per Section	5 (sample only)	10
Total Questions	15 MCQs	30 MCQs
Marks per Q — Section A	6 marks each	3 marks each
Marks per Q — Section B	4 marks each	2 marks each
Marks per Q — Section C	10 marks each	5 marks each
Total Marks	100 marks	100 marks
Duration	(not applicable)	1 Hour
Passing Marks	50 marks (50%)	50 marks (50%)
Negative Marking	None	None
Questions	Fixed sample set	Randomised from approved bank

⚠ IMPORTANT: This model paper contains 5 sample questions per section (15 total) for illustration only. The actual CBT examination contains 10 questions per section (30 total). Total marks (100) and passing threshold (50%) are identical in both.

CANDIDATE INSTRUCTIONS

1. TEST OVERVIEW

Position: GENERAL MANAGER (LEGAL) — Trading Corporation of Pakistan

Format: All questions are Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs). Each question has four options (A, B, C, D). Only ONE option is correct.

Negative Marking: NONE — incorrect answers carry zero marks. Calculator: Not required for this CBT format.

2. TEST SECTIONS AND WEIGHTAGE

Section A: General Knowledge — 5 Qs (Model) / 10 Qs (Actual) — 3 marks each — Section Total: 30

Section B: English Language — 5 Qs (Model) / 10 Qs (Actual) — 2 marks each — Section Total: 20

Section C: Technical Knowledge — 5 Qs (Model) / 10 Qs (Actual) — 5 marks each — Section Total: 50

TOTAL: 15 / 30 — 100 marks

** Marks per question shown are for the actual CBT examination. In this model paper, marks are proportionally higher (6/4/10) to maintain 100-mark total across 15 questions.*

3. CBT EXAMINATION DETAILS

The actual examination is administered via a Computer-Based Testing (CBT) platform. Candidates select their answer on screen. The CBT system automatically records and scores all responses. Results are available immediately upon submission. Questions are drawn randomly from a pre-approved question bank — each candidate receives a unique randomised set. Mobile phones and all electronic devices are strictly prohibited.

4. IMPORTANT NOTICE — MODEL PAPER vs ACTUAL EXAM

This model paper contains 5 sample questions per section (15 total). It is published solely to familiarise candidates with the question format, style, and difficulty level. The actual CBT examination contains 10 questions per section (30 total), completed in 1 hour. Total marks (100) and passing threshold (50%) are the same in both.

SECTION A — GENERAL KNOWLEDGE [30 Marks | 5 Questions | 6 Marks Each]

Difficulty level: Executive / applied. Questions test professional judgment — not factual recall. All questions are scenario and judgment-based.

Q1. A government commercial entity's CEO receives an informal approach from the opposing party's Chairman in an ongoing litigation, suggesting the case should be 'resolved quietly' without involving lawyers on either side. The CEO asks the GM (Legal) for advice. Which response reflects the MOST professionally sound judgment? **[6 marks]**

(A) The CEO should engage directly with the opposing Chairman — senior executive-level dialogue often resolves disputes more efficiently than legal proceedings.

(B) Direct the legal team to prepare an immediate settlement offer based on the CEO's assessment of the opposing party's likely demands.

(C) Advise the CEO in writing that any settlement discussions must be conducted through proper legal channels with counsel present on both sides and all proceedings formally documented; that informal discussions between principals without lawyers create evidentiary risks and may compromise the entity's legal position; and that the appropriate route is a without-prejudice settlement meeting arranged through respective legal counsel — with this advice itself formally documented.

(D) Refer the matter directly to the Board of Directors without first advising the CEO on the professional and legal risks of the proposed approach.

Answer: (C)

Settlement discussions between unrepresented principals create evidentiary exposure, undermine legal strategy, and may inadvertently waive rights. The GM (Legal)'s overriding duty is to channel the CEO's intent into a legally protected, documented process. Options A, B, and D are each professionally incomplete.

Q2. A federal SOE's legal department is reviewing a new SECP circular requiring disclosure of material litigation within seven days of commencement. The entity is currently defending 14 cases, three of which may be material. The GM (Legal) must advise the Board on compliance. Which analysis is MOST complete? **[6 marks]**

(A) Disclose all 14 cases to SECP — blanket disclosure demonstrates full transparency and eliminates the risk of under-disclosure.

(B) Establish a clear materiality threshold consistent with SECP's guidance; apply it to each of the 14 cases with documented reasoning; disclose the three potentially material cases within the regulatory timeframe; and present the Board with a reusable materiality assessment framework for future litigation disclosures. Borderline cases should err on the side of disclosure.

(C) Disclose only cases where the opposing party's counsel is already in possession of the facts — internal strategy documents are exempt from SECP disclosure requirements.

(D) The seven-day window has elapsed for existing cases — retroactive disclosure would attract additional regulatory scrutiny, so the safer course is to manage disclosures prospectively only.

Answer: (B)

A materiality threshold must be defined, documented, and applied consistently — arbitrary full disclosure (A) or selective non-disclosure (C, D) both create compliance and governance risk. The framework approach enables defensible, consistent decisions across all future litigation.

Q3. A government commercial entity's external law firm advises that a particular clause in a major supply contract is 'legally valid but commercially aggressive — it effectively strips the counterparty of any remedy for losses caused by the entity's own delays.' The Board asks the GM (Legal) whether to include this clause. Which response best demonstrates executive-level legal judgment?

[6 marks]

(A) Advise the Board that, although the clause may be technically enforceable, it creates four material risks: (i) reputational — enforcement signals bad faith; (ii) counterparty relationship — strategic suppliers may withdraw from future contracts; (iii) regulatory — PPRA's fair-dealing principles may be strained; and (iv) judicial — courts may apply contra proferentem or public policy considerations to limit its effect. Recommend replacing it with a balanced clause that protects the entity's interests without appearing predatory.

(B) Accept the clause — it provides maximum legal protection and the external law firm has confirmed its validity, which is the relevant professional standard.

(C) Reject the clause entirely — any clause limiting a counterparty's remedies for the entity's own defaults is automatically void under Section 23 of the Contract Act 1872.

(D) Include the clause but do not draw the counterparty's attention to it during negotiations — they may raise objections at the signing stage if they wish.

Answer: (A)

A GM (Legal) must advise on legal, commercial, reputational, and enforceability risk — not simply validate what external counsel has confirmed as technically permissible. Option B is passive; Option C is legally incorrect; Option D is contrary to good-faith dealing standards expected of government entities.

Q4. A federal commercial entity's GM (Legal) is asked to advise on whether the entity can rely solely on its own legal team's interpretation of a statutory ambiguity that directly affects a series of high-value commodity import contracts. Which is the MOST professionally complete advice?

[6 marks]

(A) Advise that for a statutory ambiguity with significant financial and legal consequences, reliance solely on internal interpretation creates risk. The appropriate process: (i) prepare a formal legal query referencing the specific provision; (ii) refer to the Ministry of Law & Justice for an official legal opinion — government entities are entitled and often obligated to seek such opinions on statutory questions; (iii) obtain concurrent guidance from the Ministry of Commerce as the line Ministry; and (iv) document the full opinion trail before committing to the contract structure. Government Liaison is a named GM (Legal) responsibility.

(B) Yes — the entity's own legal team is qualified to interpret statutory provisions, and seeking external opinions creates unnecessary delays in commercial operations.

(C) Interpret the provision in whichever way is most commercially favourable to the entity — statutory ambiguity is a well-recognised area where creative legal interpretation is appropriate.

(D) Halt all contracting activity until Parliament clarifies the statutory provision through amendment — the entity cannot lawfully proceed under an ambiguous statute.

Answer: (A)

Obtaining legal opinions from the Ministry of Law & Justice and Ministry of Commerce is a named TCP-specific obligation in the GM (Legal) JD. For a significant statutory ambiguity, the formal

government legal opinion mechanism is both appropriate and often expected. Options B, C, and D bypass the correct institutional opinion channels.

Q5. A government commercial entity is considering litigation against a former contractor for breach of contract. Estimated damages: PKR 45 million. Preliminary legal assessment: 60% probability of success, litigation costs PKR 8–12 million, estimated duration 3–5 years. The Board asks the GM (Legal) whether to litigate. Which approach to advising the Board is MOST appropriate? **[6 marks]**

- (A)** Recommend immediate litigation — a 60% probability of success and PKR 45 million in potential damages clearly justify pursuing the case through the courts.
- (B)** Recommend against litigation — a 60% success probability is insufficiently certain to justify the cost and management distraction over a 3–5 year period.
- (C)** Present a structured analysis: expected value of litigating $\approx (60\% \times \text{PKR } 45\text{m}) - \text{PKR } 10\text{m}$ costs $\approx \text{PKR } 17\text{m}$, discounted for the time value of a 4-year resolution; compare against alternative dispute resolution (arbitration, mediation, negotiated settlement) that may yield faster, cheaper resolution; quantify management time and reputational costs; and recommend a two-track approach — initiate without-prejudice settlement discussions while preserving the legal case. The Board should make a risk-adjusted decision.
- (D)** Refer the litigation decision entirely to external counsel and ask them to advise the Board directly — the GM (Legal) should not pre-empt external lawyers' professional judgment on litigation strategy.

Answer: (C)

A GM (Legal) advising a Board on litigation strategy must present a risk-adjusted cost-benefit analysis, not a binary recommendation. Option A ignores cost and time; Option B is equally oversimplified; Option D abdicates the GM's own advisory responsibility.

SECTION A — ANSWER KEY SUMMARY

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Note
(C)	(B)	(A)	(A)	(C)	<i>Actual CBT will present different randomised questions at the same difficulty level.</i>

SECTION B — ENGLISH LANGUAGE & COMPREHENSION [20 Marks | 5 Questions | 4 Marks Each]

Difficulty level: Professional management. Questions test general English language proficiency — reading comprehension, vocabulary precision, formal writing register, and grammar — at an executive professional level.

Q6. Four versions of a written notice from a government organisation to a contractor are given below. Which is MOST appropriate for formal written correspondence that may be relied upon in legal proceedings? **[4 marks]**

- (A) Hi, just to let you know that the problems we've identified need to be fixed soon or we may have to take action.
- (B) Further to our conversation, please note that the issues raised must be remedied as soon as possible, otherwise there may be consequences for the contract.
- (C) You are hereby warned that the defects must be remedied forthwith, failing which the consequences stipulated shall follow.
- (D) This notice formally requires you, in your capacity as contractor under Agreement No. [Ref], to remedy the defects identified in the attached Defect Schedule within fourteen (14) calendar days from the date hereof, failing which the Authority reserves the right to engage an alternative contractor and recover all associated costs from amounts outstanding under the contract.

Answer: (D)

Option D contains every element a formal legal notice requires: identification of the contracting party and capacity, specific agreement reference, the particular deficiencies (attached schedule), a precise and defined timeframe, and a clearly stated consequence. Options A and B use informal register unsuitable for correspondence that may be tendered in proceedings. Option C uses archaic language but crucially omits the specific agreement reference, defect schedule, and precise timeline — making it legally weak.

Q7. A court judgment reads: 'The defendant failed to exercise the standard of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised in the same circumstances.' The 'reasonably prudent person' standard in this legal context refers to: **[4 marks]**

- (A) A notional, objectively assessed benchmark of behaviour — the standard expected of a person of ordinary competence and care in the same situation. It is neither the standard of an expert nor the lowest possible standard, but the level of care that society expects of a careful, reasonable person acting without negligence.
- (B) The standard of a qualified legal or technical professional acting within their recognised area of specialisation.
- (C) A person who avoids taking any risks whatsoever and exercises maximum caution in all circumstances.
- (D) A person who has previously encountered similar circumstances and therefore possesses specific knowledge of the precautions required.

Answer: (A)

The 'reasonably prudent person' is a cornerstone of negligence law — an objective, normative standard set by reference to an ordinary, careful person. It is not the standard of an expert (higher),

not a risk-avoider (too high), and not based on the defendant's personal characteristics or experience (subjective). Options B, C, and D each substitute a subjective or specialist standard for the objective community standard.

Q8. Read the following extract: 'The legal department processed 847 contracts during the financial year. Of these, 312 (36.8%) were returned by counterparties with proposed amendments. The team accepted 71% of counterparty amendments without escalation, negotiated 18%, and rejected 11%. No record was maintained of the rationale for accepting or rejecting individual amendments.' Which inference is MOST strongly supported by this extract? **[4 marks]**

(A) The legal team is accepting too many counterparty amendments — a rejection rate of only 11% indicates the team is insufficiently assertive in protecting the organisation's interests.

(B) The fact that 36.8% of contracts were returned with amendments indicates that the organisation's initial contract drafts contain systematic weaknesses that need to be addressed at source.

(C) The absence of documented rationale for accepting or rejecting amendments means there is no audit trail, no accountability for decisions with material commercial and legal implications, and no basis for identifying patterns or improving contract drafting — a significant governance gap for a function managing 847 contracts annually.

(D) A counterparty amendment return rate of 36.8% is within normal commercial range and the data does not reveal any particular cause for concern.

Answer: (C)

The most significant finding is the absence of a decision record — not the percentages themselves, which cannot be assessed as good or bad without a benchmark. Options A makes a directional judgment not supported by the extract; Option B assumes a causal link not stated; Option D dismisses a material finding without justification.

Q9. A formal legal letter contains this sentence: 'Pursuant to the aforesaid, we wish to bring to your kind attention that your esteemed organisation's obligations vis-à-vis the hereinabove mentioned contractual provisions remain unfulfilled notwithstanding our repeated verbal communications.' Identify the THREE MOST significant deficiencies for effective formal legal communication. **[4 marks]**

(A) The sentence uses too many Latin-derived expressions — modern legal correspondence should replace 'pursuant', 'vis-à-vis', and 'notwithstanding' with plain English equivalents throughout.

(B) The sentence is excessively verbose with archaic language ('aforesaid', 'hereinabove', 'esteemed') that obscures the message; it fails to identify which specific contractual obligation or clause number has been breached; and it relies on 'repeated verbal communications' as the record of prior correspondence — reliance on undocumented verbal exchanges makes the letter legally weak and unenforceable as a formal notice.

(C) Addressing the letter to 'your esteemed organisation' rather than to a named individual makes it insufficiently specific for a formal legal notice.

(D) The sentence contains a grammatical error in its use of 'notwithstanding' — this conjunction is being used incorrectly in this context.

Answer: (B)

Three compounding deficiencies: (1) archaic, verbose language reduces clarity and professionalism; (2) no specific clause or obligation identified — the recipient cannot know precisely what has been breached; (3) 'repeated verbal communications' — each prior

communication must be cited by date, reference number, and medium to be evidentially valid. Option A addresses minor style; Option C is a valid but lower-priority point; Option D is factually wrong.

Q10. In a formal legal opinion, the phrase 'without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing' appears before a specific example. It most precisely means: **[4 marks]**

(A) The following statement contradicts or overrides what has been stated previously — it should be read as a qualification that limits the earlier analysis.

(B) The following communication is protected from use in litigation — all statements made after this phrase are covered by without-prejudice privilege.

(C) The specific statement that follows does not narrow or restrict the scope of the general principle already established — the general principle remains fully intact, and the specific example is illustrative rather than limiting.

(D) The following analysis requires confirmation by a higher authority before it becomes legally operative or binding on the parties.

Answer: (C)

'Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing' is a drafting technique used to add a specific provision without implying that the general principle is thereby exhausted or restricted. It preserves the full width of the earlier text. This is distinct from 'without prejudice' in settlement communications (Option B), and does not signal contradiction (Option A) or conditionality (Option D).

SECTION B — ANSWER KEY SUMMARY

Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Note
(D)	(A)	(C)	(B)	(C)	<i>Actual CBT will present different randomised questions at the same difficulty level.</i>

SECTION C — TECHNICAL / PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE [50 Marks | 5 Questions | 10 Marks Each]

Difficulty level: Senior management / executive. All questions are scenario-based and require integration of multiple technical concepts. Definitions alone are not sufficient to answer correctly.

Q11. A government commercial entity's long-term supply contract contains a force majeure clause: 'Neither party shall be liable for delay or failure to perform to the extent caused by circumstances beyond its reasonable control, including but not limited to acts of God, war, civil commotion, government action, or labour disputes.' The supplier claims force majeure due to global shipping disruptions, resulting in a four-month delay and PKR 80 million in losses to the entity. The GM (Legal) must advise the Board. Which analysis is MOST complete? **[10 marks]**

(A) Assess: (i) whether the shipping disruption qualifies as 'beyond reasonable control' — courts require the event to be unforeseeable and unavoidable; geopolitical tensions already developing when the contract was signed may not qualify; (ii) whether the supplier took all reasonable mitigation steps (alternative routes, carriers, sourcing); (iii) whether the supplier gave timely contractual notice; (iv) the financial cost-benefit of accepting versus contesting the claim — PKR 80m in losses against estimated litigation cost; and (v) whether the entity's own payment obligations are suspended during the claimed force majeure period. Present a risk-assessed recommendation with settlement and litigation options.

(B) Accept the claim — global shipping disruptions are self-evidently beyond any supplier's control, and contesting a clearly valid force majeure claim would be disproportionate and damage the commercial relationship.

(C) Reject the claim outright — force majeure clauses under Pakistani contract law are interpreted strictly and rarely succeed, particularly for commercial shipping disruptions.

(D) The force majeure assessment is a procurement matter — the GM (Legal) should review only the clause's drafting validity and leave the commercial assessment to the procurement team.

Answer: (A)

A force majeure analysis is multi-factorial: foreseeability at contract date, mitigation duty, notice compliance, and financial exposure all matter. The GM (Legal) must present an evidence-based assessment of each factor. Option B accepts on principle; Option C rejects on principle; Option D delegates the substantive analysis to procurement.

Q12. During litigation involving a government commercial entity, the legal team discovers, while preparing court-ordered document production, a series of internal email chains that are potentially damaging to the entity's case. These have not previously been flagged to the GM (Legal). What is the CORRECT legal and ethical response? **[10 marks]**

(A) Instruct the team to file the emails in a folder marked as legally privileged — attorney-client privilege protects internal communications involving the legal team from production.

(B) Produce only documents that support the entity's case — the court order requires production of relevant documents, and adverse documents are not relevant to the entity's own claim.

(C) Determine precisely what the court's production order requires; if the adverse emails fall within the order's scope, they must be produced — withholding court-ordered documents

constitutes contempt of court and professional misconduct regardless of their effect on the outcome; advise senior management that litigation strategy may need to be reassessed; and document the discovery, the assessment, and the advice given in full. The GM (Legal)'s overriding duty runs to the court, not to the client's preferred outcome.

(D) Given that the emails pre-date the commencement of litigation and relate to operational matters, treat them as routine records outside the scope of the production order without further analysis.

Answer: (C)

The duty to comply with a court production order is absolute — it overrides the client's interest in the litigation outcome. Misapplying privilege (A), selective production (B), or treating adverse documents as out of scope without analysis (D) each constitute conduct that could expose the entity to contempt proceedings and the GM to professional sanctions.

Q13. A government commercial entity is negotiating a PKR 2.5 billion EPC contract. The contractor's draft limits total aggregate liability for all claims — including delays, defects, and third-party losses — to 10% of contract value (PKR 250 million). The GM (Legal) is reviewing the contract before Board approval. Which analysis is MOST complete?

[10 marks]

(A) A 10% aggregate cap on a PKR 2.5bn contract means the contractor's maximum exposure across all claims is PKR 250 million — likely wholly inadequate for major defects or delays on a project of this scale. Recommend: (i) negotiating the cap to at least the value of performance bond and insurance coverage (typically 100% for EPC contracts); (ii) expressly carving out fraud, wilful misconduct, and personal injury/death from the cap; (iii) verifying that the contractor's professional indemnity and all-risks insurance exceeds the contractual cap; (iv) ensuring the contract includes robust performance bonds and advance payment guarantees as independent financial security; and (v) benchmarking the cap against comparable government EPC contracts.

(B) Accept the 10% cap — international EPC contracts standardly include aggregate liability caps, and insisting on higher limits may cause the contractor to withdraw from negotiations.

(C) Reject the liability cap entirely — PPRA Rules 2004 prohibit limitation of liability clauses in government contracts as contrary to public interest.

(D) The aggregate liability cap is a commercial term outside the GM (Legal)'s advisory remit — the procurement team should negotiate it and the GM (Legal) should restrict review to drafting accuracy.

Answer: (A)

A liability cap has direct legal, financial, and risk management implications — it is squarely within the GM (Legal)'s advisory mandate. Options B, C, and D each involve inappropriate passivity, incorrect law, or scope abdication.

Q14. The Ministry of Commerce issues an urgent directive to a government commercial entity to execute a multi-year commodity supply contract with a specific foreign supplier, bypassing competitive bidding under PPRA Rules 2004, on grounds of 'national interest urgency.' The CEO instructs the GM (Legal) to finalise the contract immediately. The GM (Legal)'s review reveals: (i) no formal PPRA single-source exemption order has been issued; (ii) the draft contract contains unlimited liability provisions in favour of the supplier with no performance bond requirement; (iii) the contract value exceeds PKR 500 million, triggering mandatory Board approval that has not yet been obtained. Which is the MOST professionally complete response?

[10 marks]

(A) Execute the contract as directed — a Ministry directive constitutes superior legal authority that overrides PPRA Rules and internal Board approval requirements for subordinate government entities.

(B) Halt execution; document all three compliance deficiencies in a formal written note to the CEO and CFO; advise that a valid PPRA single-source exemption order (not merely a Ministry letter) must be obtained before execution; convene an emergency Board meeting or seek a written circular resolution for the required PKR 500m+ approval; negotiate the unlimited liability clause and absence of performance bond before signature; and confirm in writing that if the CEO proceeds regardless, the GM (Legal) has formally discharged their advisory obligation and the direction constitutes a documented management override.

(C) Execute the contract but insert a handwritten annotation that the liability clause is disputed — informal side annotations have legal effect and can protect the entity's interests if disputes arise later.

(D) Refer the matter to external counsel and await their opinion before taking any position with the CEO — it would be premature for the GM (Legal) to advise against a Ministry directive without independent external confirmation.

Answer: (B)

A Ministry letter does not automatically constitute a PPRA-compliant single-source exemption — PPRA Rules 2004 require a specific formal exemption process. Board approval thresholds are mandatory. The unlimited liability and missing performance bond are material financial risks. The GM (Legal) must document the advisory, protect their professional position, and chart the only path to compliant contract execution.

Q15. A government commercial entity is in arbitration over PKR 120 million in disputed contract payments. Midway through proceedings, external counsel advises that the entity's key witness — a retired project manager and the only person with direct knowledge of the disputed events — has fallen seriously ill and may be unable to testify. The GM (Legal) must advise the Board and direct the legal team.

[10 marks]

(A) Apply immediately for an adjournment of the arbitration proceedings until the witness recovers — arbitral tribunals routinely grant adjournments on humanitarian grounds and the entity's case cannot proceed without this witness.

(B) Take five parallel steps: (i) obtain the witness's sworn affidavit or witness statement while they retain capacity — most institutional arbitration rules permit written evidence and video testimony as alternatives to live appearance; (ii) apply to the tribunal for leave to present testimony by video link or pre-recorded deposition; (iii) assess whether the documentary record alone can support the entity's core case without live testimony; (iv) identify other witnesses with partial corroborating knowledge; and (v) brief the Board on the changed risk profile and recommend revision of the settlement authority accordingly. Relying solely on an adjournment request without securing the evidence creates irreversible risk.

(C) Advise the Board to concede the disputed PKR 120 million — without the key witness, the entity's case cannot succeed and it is prudent to minimise further legal expenditure.

(D) Apply to the arbitral tribunal to have the proceedings set aside and recommenced before a fresh tribunal at a later date, preserving the entity's right to present full evidence when the witness has recovered.

Answer: (B)

A prepared GM (Legal) never relies on a single course of action when facing an evidentiary crisis. Option A over-relies on tribunal discretion (adjournments are not guaranteed). Option C is a premature concession of a PKR 120m claim. Option D misunderstands arbitral procedure — set-aside is a remedy for procedural irregularity, not a scheduling tool.

SECTION C — ANSWER KEY SUMMARY

Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Note
(A)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(B)	<i>Actual CBT will present different randomised questions at the same difficulty level.</i>

COMPETENCY MAPPING & CBT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The table below maps the model paper question categories to competencies required for the GENERAL MANAGER (LEGAL) role at TCP.

Section	Topic Area	Qs	Marks	Primary Competency	JD Alignment
Section A	Legal strategy & advisory, regulatory compliance awareness, contract management, government liaison obligations, litigation economics	5	30	Analytical Ability + Strategic Orientation	Legal strategy, risk management, regulatory compliance, government liaison
Section B	General English language proficiency — reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing register, grammar	5	20	Communication	Board reporting, legal opinions, correspondence, case updates
Section C	Force majeure analysis, court document production, EPC contract liability, PPRA/Ministry directive compliance, arbitration management	5	50	Technical Expertise + Risk Thinking + Analytical Ability	Contract management, litigation, PPRA compliance, legal case management

CBT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

MARKING METHODOLOGY
 All questions are MCQ — fully objective. Each question carries the section-prescribed marks; no partial credit; no negative marking. The CBT platform automatically scores all responses at submission. Results (complete merit list in order of scores) are published within 48 hours of the examination as required under TCP RFP Clause 8(f).

RANDOMISATION AND QUESTION BANK
 The actual examination draws questions randomly from a pre-approved, vetted question bank. Each candidate receives a unique set of questions covering the same sections, weightages, and difficulty levels as this model paper. This approach ensures examination integrity, prevents paper leakage, and supports merit-based, transparent selection in compliance with PPRA Rules 2004.

SHORTLISTING GUIDELINES
 Candidates scoring 50% or above qualify for the next stage of the selection process. CBT scores are combined with other assessment criteria — qualifications, experience, and further evaluation stages — to determine merit order for final consideration by TCP per RFP Clause 8(g).

— END OF MODEL TEST PAPER —