राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग एवं अवसंरचना विकास निगम लिमिटेड
सड़क परिवहन और राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार
तीसरी मंजिल, पीटीआई बिल्डिंग, 4–संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली–110 001
National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited
Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Govt. of India
3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4-Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001, +91 11 2335 1282, www.nhidcl.com
CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062
सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का उपक्रम
A PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKING

BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - BUILDING THE NATION

NHIDCL/Civil work/Joram Koloriang (35-50)/Ar.Pr./2016 **Date: 03/03/2017**

To,

M/s K.R.Anand – M/s KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	M/s Sushee Infra & Mining Limited	M/s Madhucon Projects Limited
M/s RMN – KMV (JV)	M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Limited	M/s TK engineering consortium Pvt. Ltd. - M/s Brand Eagle (JV)
	M/s Progressive Construction Limited	

Subject: Construction of two-Lane with paved shoulders of Joram – Koloriang Road (NH-713) on EPC basis from existing Km 35.150 to Km 50.050 [Design Km. 32.050 to Km. 44.000] (Design Length - 11.95 Km) in the state of Arunachal Pradesh under SARDP-NE- Opening of Financial Bids regarding

Sir,

Please refer to your bid dated 20.02.2017 submitted towards subject cited project. The following is the list of technically responsive/Non responsive Bidders whose financial bids shall be opened on **10.03.2017 at 1115 hrs** in NHIDCL HQ, 3rd Floor PTI Building, 4-Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

SI.No	Name of the Bidder / JV	Status of eligibility
1	M/s K.R.Anand – M/s KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Eligible
2	M/s Sushee Infra & Mining Limited	Eligible
3	M/s Madhucon Projects Limited	Eligible
4	M/s RMN – KMV (JV)	Eligible
5	M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Limited	Eligible
6	M/s TK engineering consortium Pvt. Ltd. - M/s Brand Eagle (JV)	Eligible
7	M/s Progressive Construction Limited	Not Eligible

2. **In case of any Representation, the same may be made latest by 08.03.2017 (1700 hrs)**

3. All the Authorized Representatives are requested to attend the opening of Financial Bids at the Scheduled date and Time.

3103

A.K JHA
DGM (Tech)

Enclosure: Copy of ETEC dated 02-03-2017

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

Minutes of Meetings of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) received for "CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-LANE WITH PAVED SHOULDERS OF JORAM – KOLORIANG ROAD (NH-713) ON EPC BASIS FROM EXISTING KM 35.150 TO KM 50.050 [DESIGN KM. 32.050 TO KM. 44.000] (DESIGN LENGTH - 11.95 KM) IN THE STATE OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH UNDER SARDP-NE on 02.03.2017

1. The RFPs for the subject work were invited with bid due date as 20.02.2017 till 1100 hrs.

2. Having opened the Technical Bids on 21.02.2017 received from the following applicants in the presence of applicant's representatives who chose to attend the RFP opening, the hard copy of the original documents along with the soft copy (as received from CPP portal) were handed over to the concerned Financial Consultants for carrying out the evaluation of the Technical Bids.

Name Of Work	Name Of bidders	Name of Financial Consultant
CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-LANE WITH PAVED SHOULDERS OF JORAM – KOLORIANG ROAD (NH-713) ON EPC BASIS FROM EXISTING KM 35.150 TO KM 50.050 [DESIGN KM. 32.050 TO KM. 44.000] (DESIGN LENGTH - 11.95 KM) IN THE STATE OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH UNDER SARDP-NE	M/s RMN-KMV Joint Venture	M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co., Chartered Accountant
	M/s. T. K. Engineering Consortium Pvt. Ltdin JV with Brand Eagles	
	M/s. Progressive Constructions Limited	
	M/s. Sushee Infra & Mining Limited	
	M/s Madhucon Projects Limited	
	M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.	
	M/s K R Anand in JV with KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd.	

3. The Financial Consultant in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs. 124.67 Crore.**

S.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	124.67
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	187.01
3	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	112.21
4	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	37.402
5	Minimum required amount of COMPLETED Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least one similar work as per	31.17

	clause 2.2.2.2 (ii)	
6	For a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 , the Capital Cost of the project should be more than (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (c))	12.47
7	Minimum required amount of self constructed project by the Bidder for a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d))	one half of the Project Cost of eligible projects as defined in clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d).
8	For a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 3&4 , the receipt / payments of the project should be more than (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (ii))	12.47
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	6.23
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	3.738
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.246
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	24.93
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	14.958
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	4.986
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	124.67
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	74.802
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	24.934

4. In the preliminary evaluation, there were certain information/clarification were required by the financial consultant to consolidate the evaluation. Accordingly, the queries were raised with the respective bidders; their reply has since been received and handed over to financial consultant. The financial consultant, M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co. has submitted the Evaluation report. In the Evaluation report, the detail of Technical and Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the seven bidders as per the report including the final outcome is as under.

1. *M/s RMN-KMV Joint Venture*

SN.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words *"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed* ***and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are not as per required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer".***	In the Format of para 14, the words are "It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them (or) work executed and certified by the Engineer-In-Charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer". Hence the certificates taken earlier ignoring the words on the right side of "OR" were used for this tender. The certificates from Auditor as per required format are attached herewith.	Bidder has submitted the required certificates, the same has been considered and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly.
2.	Project has claimed the project code 1d under category 3. **Please clarify through supporting documents (Statutory Auditor/ client certificates) how the subject project covers under category 3 as per clause 2.2.2.5 IV of RFP and whether the construction includes construction of SH/NH/MDR/city road/district road etc. along with the copy of MOU regarding entire work has been executed by the Bidder is required.**	Please find attached extract of contract agreement Page No. 179, which defines the project Kandi-Shadnagar Road as a cluster of MDR & ODR (Cl 1.3.1). Hope this meets the requirement to qualify the project under category 3. Copy of Supplementary Agreement to the MOU is attached through which Meenakshi Infrastructures Private Limited., has agreed to pass on their share of 51% to RMN Infrastructures Limited on back-to-back basis.	Bidder has provided the requisite details and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated as per RFP.

3.	The Statutory Auditor certificate has been submitted by the bidder for project code **"1p"** claimed under category 4. However there are few differences in the in the Statutory Auditor certificate & the ANNEX-IV which are as follows: 1. In certificate name of the Authority is mentioned as "Irrigation & CAD Department, A.P" while in the ANNEX-IV it is mentioned as "Superintending Engineer, RBILSP, Pebbair" **Please Clarify.**	Copy of LOA is attached for your information. The Client is Irrigation & CAD Department, represented by The Superintending Engineer, RBLISP Circle, Pebbair.	Bidder has provided the requisite details and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly
4.	The Statutory Auditor certificate has been submitted by the bidder for project code **"1r"** claimed under category 4. However there are few differences in the in the Statutory Auditor certificate & the ANNEX-IV which are as follows: 1. In certificate name of the authority is mentioned as "Water Resource Department" while in the ANNEX-IV it is mentioned as "Superintending Engineer, HNSS Circle No. 2 A.P" **Please Clarify.**	Copy of LOA is attached for your information. The Client is Water Resources Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh represented by The Superintending Engineer, HNSS Circle No.2, HLC Colony, Ananthapuramu.	Bidder has provided the requisite details and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly
5.	Details submitted by the Bidder for Value of B, it is mentioned that value of existing commitments are for next 2 years, however the same is required for next three years as per RFP. **Please clarify.**	Please refer to Col.8- Balance value of work/(s) to be completed are calculated taking into account the total outstanding work/(s) and not for next 2 years. In view of above, the bid capacity does not change even for 3 years duration.	Bidder has stated in its reply that Balance value of work/(s) to be completed are calculated taking into account the total outstanding work/(s) and not for next 2 years, therefore, the same may be considered.

2. **M/s. T. K. Engineering Consortium Pvt. Ltd. – Brand Eagles**

SN.	Clarification Required	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words *"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed* ***and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are not as per required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/ Independent Engineer/ Authority's Engineer".***	We have submitted same format of Statutory Auditor Certificates for projects claimed under category 3.	Reply submitted by the bidder fulfills the requirement of clarification sought, therefore, the same may be accepted.
2.	As per the details mentioned in Annex IV and Statutory Auditor Certificate, project code a to d are either allotted to SRK alone or SRK & T,K. Engineering JV however further it is mentioned that the entire work is executed by T.K. Engineering. **Please clarify through supporting documents that the work has actually been executed by TK Engineering only.**	In **project code a to d** are either allotted to SRK alone or SRK & TK Engineering JV, however entire 100% work is executed by TK Engineering and Statutory Auditor certified that entire amount has received by TK Engineering. For evaluation of Technical Capacity, please go through the RPF document Clause *2.2.2.5 (iii)(a)(I) In case of projects executed by applicant under category 3 and 4 as a member of Joint Venture, the project cost should be restricted to the share of the applicant in the*	Reply submitted by the bidder fulfills the requirement of clarification sought; therefore, the same may be accepted.

		joint venture for determining eligibility as per provision under clause 2.2.2.2 (ii). ***In case Statutory Auditor certifies that, the work of other member(s) is also executed by the applicant, then the total share executed by applicant can be considered for determining eligibility as per provision under clause 2.2.2.2 (ii).***	
3.	The Value of A considered by the bidder is based on other operating revenues as shown under the Head "Revenue from Operations" in the balance sheet related to the respective previous five years. However, as per clause 2.2.2.1 of RFP Value of A should be from civil engineering works in respect of EPC projects (turnkey projects / item rate contract / construction works). ***Kindly provide the bifurcation of Revenue from operations for determining the correct value of A.***	All revenue from operations are only Civil Engineering Works undertaken by us in the balance sheet related the respective previous five years. Moreover, Statutory Auditor certified the total values of Civil Engineering Works undertaken w.r.t. EPC Projects in the last five years for determining the value of A ***(please check the page 269)***.	Bidder has provided the requisite details and Bid Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly
4.	*The Statement given by Statutory Auditor of bidder for certifying Value of B submitted for both bidders do not certify the words* ***"anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited"*** which are required as per Format of Annex-VI to Appendix-1A. ***Kindly provide the correct certificate duly incorporating the required statement by Statutory Auditor.***	We have submitted same format of Statutory Auditor Certificates for determining the value of B.	The exact format has not been submitted, however, as the Statutory Auditor has certified that No awarded / ongoing works has been left in the aforesaid statement which has been awarded to M/s. TK Engineering Consortium Private Limited, therefore the the same has been considered and bid capacity has been calculated accordingly.
5.	Bidder has submitted the **Power of Attorney for Lead Member of Joint Venture, wherein the date of Execution**	In the **Power of Attorney for Lead Member of Joint Venture** submitted by us,	Bidder has requested to consider date of notarization as Execution date. Reply submitted by the

	of Power of Attorney is not mentioned.	the date of execution of Power of Attorney is not mentioned in 2nd page. However, it is mentioned as 11/02/2017 in the 1st page, hence you may consider the date of execution of Power of Attorney is 11/02/2017.	Bidder may be accepted.

3. **M/s. Progressive Constructions Limited**

SN.	Clarification Required	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The bidder has informed on page no. 32 of the submitted bid that the work pertaining to NH-31C in Assam under Phase-II programme of NHDP Package EW-11 (AS-12) was terminated by NHAI on 14.03.2016. ***Kindly provide the termination order passed by NHAI and other related correspondence for the same.***	Submitting the Termination order of NHAI. Note: NHIDCL principally accepted our reply related to termination of Package AS-12 and thereby qualified us for BID of "Rehabilitation and up-gradation of Doimukh-Harmuti road from Harmuti Junction (0/00 km) to Khula camp (14/370 km) and Doimukh (0/000 km) to Bagh Tinali (3/100 km) two lane carriageway in the State of Assam and Arunachal Pradeshon EPC basis" Project.	As per the submitted termination order passed by NHAI, the contract of NHDP Package EW-11 (AS-12) was terminated by NHAI on 14.03.3016 for breach by the bidder and therefore the condition as specified under clause 2.1.19 has not been fulfilled. Therefore, the bid of the bidder should be rejected. However, as per clause 2.1.19.3 of RFP, The Authority reserves the right to reject an otherwise eligible bidder on the basis of the information provided under clause 2.1.19. The decision of the Authority in this case shall be final. Therefore, the Authority may take a view for acceptance or rejection of bid on this ground.
2.	In Appendix IA submitted by the Bidder, pt 6 is not as per the format given in RFP. **Please Clarify.**	Resubmitting the revised Appendix IA	Bidder has submitted revised Appendix IA with corrected details. Fresh document cannot be considered however the same may be considered as it does have any material impact on the Bid submitted by the Bidder
3.	*The Statement given by Statutory Auditor of bidder for certifying Value of*	*In certifying value of B submitted "anticipated value*	As the Statutory Auditor has also certified that *"value of all*

	B submitted on page 323 do not certify the words ***"anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited"*** which are required as per Format of Annex-VI to Appendix-1A. ***Kindly provide the correct certificate duly incorporating the required statement by Statutory Auditor.***	*of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited". However as per ICI guidelines statutory Auditors are not suppose to certify "anticipated values or Projected Figures of works. But the statement submitted clearly states and is certified by statutory auditors that the value of all existing commitments and ongoing works is verified by books of accounts, certified account bills, duly countersigned by the client.* *The above cited reasons regarding incorporation of "anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited" is not incorporated in our submitted Statutory Auditor Certificate of value of B.*	*existing commitments and ongoing works is verified by books of accounts, certified account bills, duly countersigned by the client",* therefore the same has been considered and Bid Capacity has been calculated accordingly
4.	*The bidder has claimed project code A under category 1, however the equity shareholding certified by the Statutory Auditor for the eligible project is only up to commissioning of the project.* ***Kindly provide the details of equity shareholding for the period for which experience has been claimed i.e, for the period from 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2016 and such details should be certified by the Statutory Auditor of the bidder.***	*Submitting corrected Statutory Auditor certificate of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A*	As the equity shareholding for the required period has been provided by the statutory Auditor of the bidder, therefore, the project has been considered and evaluation has been done accordingly.
5.	The Statutory Auditor certificates has been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4 related to Project Codes B to K. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of	Submitting corrected Statutory Auditor certificate of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A	The Statutory Auditor Certificate in the required format has now been provided; therefore technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated

56

	para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words ***"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are missing. Further, in most of the certificates. The word "***achieve turnover***" has been used which is not mentioned in the required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A.***		accordingly.
6.	The bidder claims for Project code b that the work has been substantially completed, however, no supporting documents has been submitted which established that more than 90% of the Value of work has been completed. ***Kindly provide the supporting documents / certificates which establish that more than 90% of value of work has been completed for project code b.***	Submitting the Certified Running Account Bill which is indicate that more than 90% value of work was completed	The supporting document as provided by the bidder establish that the more than 90% value of work has been completed, therefore, the same has been considered for eligibility as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of RFP
7.	The bidder has submitted the Annex-III, financial Capacity of the bidder but not as per Format provided in the RFP. **Please Clarify.**	Resubmitting the revised Annex-III	Bidder has submitted the requisite details, the same may be considered.
8.	In the Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder, point no. 14 and 15 as per format given under Appendix – II (Bank Guarantee for Bid Security) are not mentioned.	Submitting the Undertaking for Bank Guarantee amendments	The required point no.14 and 15 has not been incorporated in the Bank Guarantee. Therefore the Authority may take a view to accept the bid on this ground.

	Further in last para (pt. 14) Bank Guarantee is required to be oparatable at Delhi Branch however Bank Guarantee submitted by Bidder, Guwahati Brach is mentioned. ***Kindly clarify and provide the amendment while including the aforesaid missing clause.***	By mistake wrongly uploaded the Appendix II Now we are submitting the Appendix II	

4. *M/s. Sushee Infra & Mining Limited*

SN.	Clarification Required	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words *"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed* ***and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are not as per required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer".***	With reference to the above, we are providing the certificates by Statutory Auditors as per the format of para 14 of Annex –IV to Appendix-1A.	Bidder has submitted the required certificates, the same has been considered and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly.

5. *Madhucon Projects Limited*

SN.	Clarification Required	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words *"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed* ***and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are not as per required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer" .***	The format for the certificate reads"It is certified that bidder received payments from its clients for construction works executed by them **or** work executed and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/ Independent Engineer/ Authority's Engineer" (Bold and underline added) Here the word 'or' is conspicuous and connects two criteria viz: 1. that bidder received payments from its clients for construction works executed by them 2. work executed and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/ Independent Engineer/ Authority's Engineer As these two criteria are connected with 'or', the clause is complied, when any one of the criteria is satisfied. Hence if the certificate states that either of the criteria (either of (1) or (2) above)is satisfied , then the complete clause is complied. Here we have produced the certificate with criteria (1) and obviously while criteria(1) is satisfied, criteria (2) becomes redundant. So the Certificates by statutory auditor with criteria (1) are as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annexure-IV to Appendix-1A and the certificates issued by the Engineer-in-charge/ Independent Engineer/ Authority's Engineer are not required	Reply submitted by the Bidder may be accepted.

		because criteria (2) is not claimed.	
2.	In Bank Guarantee submitted by the Bidder, point 15 is not mentioned. ***Kindly clarify and provide the amendment while including the aforesaid missing clause.***	The Bank Guarantee is issued by Oriental Bank of Commerce. SFMS gateway for Inland Bank Guarantee is under implementation in Oriental Bank of commerce and yet to be established. In this regard Bank has taken amendment from NHIDCL to provide the Bank Guarantee confirmation from their branch. Correspondence in this regard and Covering letter to BG mentioning the Branch of bank to get BG confirmation are enclosed as Annexure-I.	Reply submitted by th. Bidder may be accepted.
3.	The Statement given by Statutory Auditor of bidder for certifying Value of B submitted do not certify the words **"anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited"** which are required as per Format of Annex-VI to Appendix-1A. ***Kindly provide the correct certificate duly incorporating the required statement by Statutory Auditor.***	Certificate duly incorporating the required statement of Statutory Auditor is enclosed as Annexure-II.	Reply submitted by the Bidder may be accepted.

6. **M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Limited**

SN.	**Clarification Required**	**Reply Received**	**Remarks**
1.	The bidder has submitted the **Appendix-1A, Apendix-IB Annex-V, Annex-VI which are signed by the Authorized Signatory on 19.01.2017 while the Authorised signatory is getting Power on 14.02.2017 through Appendix III execution of Power of Attorney.**	The due date of tender has been extended thrice. Hence, the bid documents hav been prepared on 19-01-2017 but the final documentation has been executed on 14-02-2017 including the power of attorney. We are submitting the annexure V and Annexure VI with amended date.	Bidder has submitted fresh Appendix IA & IB & Annex V which as per RFP may not be accepted. **However Board Resolution submitted by the Bidder in the**

	Bidder to clarify.	Kindly consider the same	**Bid is dated 19.01.2017 in which Mr. Manish, the Authorised Signatory is authorized to sigh the Bid of subject. Therefore, the same may be considered.**
2.	In Appendix IA submitted by the Bidder, pt 6 is not as per the format given in RFP. **Please Clarify.**	Please find the enclosed herewith of Appendix 1A of Point 6 & 19 as per the required format	
3.	*The Statement given by Statutory Auditor of bidder for certifying Value of B submitted do not certify the words* ***"anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited"*** which are required as per Format of Annex-VI to Appendix-1A. In the Value of B bidders need to mention the year in the first line of format "A table containing value of all the existing commitments and on-going works to be completed during the next ** yearsis as follows:" is missing ***Kindly provide the correct certificate and format duly incorporating the required statement by Statutory Auditor.***	Please find the enclosed herewith of Appendix VI to Appendix-1A duly certified by the statutory auditors certifying the words ***"anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited.***	Details submitted by the Bidders fulfills the requirement of clarification sought, therefore, the same may be considered.
4.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along***	The certificates are as per the required formats only, we are again enclosing the same for your ready reference.	Bidder has submitted the required details and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated as per RFP.

	with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer". **Please clarify**		
5.	Bidder has claimed the Projects under project code d & f & j in category 3, **Please clarify through supporting documents how the subject project covers under category 3 as per clause 2.2.2.5 IV of RFP and whether the construction includes construction of SH/NH/MDR/city road/district road etc.**	We are enclosing the acceptance letter confirming the projects belongs to SH,NH & MDR as mentioned below: a) Project code D- Kirnapur Lanji Project-MDR. b) Project code F-Pithoragrah project-ODR (Now declared as State Highway). c) Project code J- Sirohi Project –SH. (Certificate enclosed)	Bidder has submitted the required details and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated as per RFP.
6.	Financial statements submitted by the Bidder for the year 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 are not legible. **Please Clarify.**	We are attaching the legible financial statement for the year 2013, 2014 & 2015	Bidder has submitted the requisite documents, the same may be considered.
7.	In 1st para address of the Authority is not mentioned. In the Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder, point no. 14 and 15 as per format given under Appendix – II (Bank Guarantee for Bid Security) are not mentioned. ***Kindly clarify and provide the amendment while including the aforesaid missing clause.***	Please find the herewith the rectified Bank Guarantee as per the format.	The required point no.14 and 15 has not been incorporated in the Bank Guarantee. Therefore the Authority may take a view to accept the bid on this ground.

8. *M/s K R Anand in JV with KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd.*

SN.	Clarification Required	Reply Received	Remarks
1.	The Statutory Auditor certificates have	**Certificates by Statutory**	Bidder has submitted the

	been submitted by the bidder for projects claimed under category 3 or Category 4. However, such certificates are not exactly as per the required format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A as the words *"It is certified that Bidder received payments from its Clients for Construction Works executed by them or work executed* ***and certified by the Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer"*** are not as per required format. ***Kindly provide the Certificates by Statutory Auditor which should be as verbatim with the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A along with the certificates issued by the "Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority's Engineer".*** **Please clarify**	**Auditor as per the format of para 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A are enclosed for your refrence.**	required certificates, the same has been considered and Technical Capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly.
2.	In Bank Guarantee submitted by the Bidder, point 15 is not mentioned. ***Kindly clarify and provide the amendment while including the aforesaid missing clause.***	**As advised by your goodself, our banker has issued a certificate for their inability to send Bank Guarantee through SFMS mode as the same facility is not yet started by our banker.**	Reply submitted hy the bidder may be accepted.
3.	Annex V submitted by the Bidder is not as per the required format. **Please Clarify.**	Annex V submitted by the Bidder is not as per the required format. Please clarify.	Reply submitted hy the bidder may be accepted.
4.	The Value of A considered by the bidder is based on other operating revenues as shown under the Head "Gross Annual Turnover" in the Profit & Loss Account related to the respective previous five years. However, as per clause 2.2.2.1 of RFP Value of A should be from civil engineering works in respect of EPC	**We hereby confirm that Gross Annual Turnover of Lead member M/s K. R. Anand and Revenue from operations of other member M/s KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt Ltd is from construction works only. Annex-IV separately by both members and complete**	Bidder has not provided the bifurcation of its turnover, therefore the reply submitted by the Bidder is not satisfactory.

	projects (turnkey projects / item rate contract / construction works). ***Kindly provide the bifurcation of Revenue from operations for determining the correct value of A.***	**financial statement for last 5 years are enclosed for your reference.**	
5.	As per the RFP, the Bidder needs to provide the Financial Statement for the last five years. The bidder has submitted only the Balance sheet & Profit & Loss Account of all the respective years. **Please provide the location in the submitted bid from where the same can be found.**	**Complete financial statement for the last 5 financial years of Lead Member M/s K. R. Anand & Other Member M/s KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt are enclosed for your reference.**	Bidder has submitted its Annual reports along with its reply however; Notes to Accounts with respect to Turnover from the Civil Construction works of the Bidder or any bifurcation of its total turnover cannot be identified from the Annual Reports submitted by the Bidder.
6.	The bidder has submitted the Bid capacity (Value of A & Value of B) of the Lead Member & Other Member jointly, which should be submitted separately by both the members. **Please clarify.**	**Bid Capacity (Value of A & Value of B) separately by Lead Member & Other Member are enclosed for your reference.**	Details submitted by the Bidder are in consonance with the details submitted by the Bidder in the bid, therefore, the same may be considered.
7.	The Bidder has claimed project code b & c – under category 3, **please clarify through supporting documents how the subject project covers under category 3 as per clause 2.2.2.5 IV of RFP and whether the construction includes construction of SH/NH/MDR/city road/district road etc..** The Bidder has claimed project code Project code j – under category 4, **Please clarify how the subject project covers under category 4 as per RFP.** One similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost which is required as per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 iv from eligible projects is not found (completed before 31.03.2016). **Please clarify.** KRA Infrastructure - details mentioned in Annex II are not in consonance with Annex IV i.e. in Annex II it is mentioned	**The project claimed at project code b & c covers under category 3 as the work under project code b & c includes the construction of municipal city roads meeting the criteria of eligible projects under category 3. Documentary evidence such as Completion certificate from clients & statutory Auditor certificates are enclosed.** **We hereby confirm that claimed project in Project code j covers under category 3 as the work includes the construction of municipal city roads meeting the criteria of eligible projects under category 3. Revised Annex-IIB, Annex-IVB & statutory Auditor certificates are enclosed for your reference.** **We confirm that we have**	Bidder in its reply has mentioned that projects claimed as project code b, c &jof KR Anand are related to construction of municipality city roads which as per RFP clause **2.2.2.5 V will covered under category 4. Therefore project code b & c will be considered as category 4 projects only.** Completed Project – Bidder has submitted the requisite certificate for 90% completion of the project as on 31.03.2016, the same has been considered.

	that the projects are covered under category 3 while as per Annexure IV projects are claimed under 4. **Please clarify through client certificates that how the subject projects covered under category 3.**	**completed similar work of 25% of Estimated Project cost under Project code-a [Payment receipt in last 5 years upto 31.03.2016 – Rs. 67.96 Crores] & Project code-b [Work completed on 16.06.2014 amounting to Rs. 40.69 Crores] as the work includes the construction of municipal city roads meeting the criteria of eligible projects under category 3 & eligible projects as per Clause 2.2.2.2 iv of RFP. Client Certificates and Statutory Auditor certificates for constructions works are enclosed for your reference.**	**KRA Infrastructure – Bidder has stated that** projects claimed are related to construction of municipality city roads which as per RFP clause **2.2.2.5 V will covered under category 4. Therefore project code b & c will be considered as category 4 projects only.**

8. The detail of Technical and Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the five bidders as per the report is as under:

	Bidder Name	Threshold Technical Capacity Assessed (in cr.)	25% of completed project (in cr.)	Net worth assessed (in cr.)	Turnover assessed in cr.	Bid Capacity in cr.
1.	**M/s RMN-KMV Joint Venture**	LM-278.90 OM-291.76 Total- 570.66	LM-145	LM- 68.38 OM-180.94 Total-249.32	LM- 244.49 OM-567.28 Total- 811.77	LM-930.421 OM-5067.74 Total-5998.161
2.	**M/s. T. K. Engineering Consortium Pvt. Ltdin JV with Brand Eagles**	LM-1460.17 OM-49.55 Total 1509.72	LM-122.22	LM-129.39 OM-17.08 Total-146.47	LM-402.49 OM-39.23 Total-441.72	LM-4209.70 OM-363.54 Total- 4573.24
3.	**M/s. Progressive Constructions Limited***	642.79	466.70	50.76	427.98	884.25
4.	**M/s. Sushee Infra & Mining Limited**	1291.77	88	271.28	641.83	5221.90
5.	**M/s Madhucon Projects Limited**	805.56	448.98	770.05	1245.88	9693.09

6.	**M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.**	288.30	105.90	33.04	91.42	1062.46
7.	**M/s K R Anand in JV with KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd.**	LM-141.78 OM-40.68 Total-182.46	135.81	LM-6.22 OM-30.68 Total- 36.9	LM-44.95 OM-118.36 Total- 163.31	LM-1079.79 OM-518.50 Total- 1598.29

*The bidder has not fulfilled the condition as mentioned under clause 2.1.19 of RFP document, therefore, the bidder is considered as conditionally eligible subject to acceptance of the bid by the Authority as per clause 2.1.19 of RFP.

8. The Financial Consultant has considered M/s Progressive Constructions Limited as conditionally eligible subject to Authority discretion for the following issues.

(i) Point no. 14 and 15 of Bank Guarantee Format for Bid Security has also not been incorporated in the Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder.

(ii) The bidder has not fulfilled the condition as mentioned under clause 2.1.19 of RFP document.

9. The Committee in reference to para 8 (i), is of the view that in accordance with the Ministry circular dated 16.1.2017 and 17.01.2017 ,it does not have any materialistic effect on the bid. Further, in reference to para 8(ii) i.e regarding termination order by NHAI, the committee has taken a considered view that the contractors bid in accordance with the clause 2.1.19 of RFP ***"The Bidder including individual or any of its Joint Venture Member should, in the last 2 (two) years, have neither failed to perform for the works of Expressways, National Highways, ISC &EI works, as evidenced by imposition of a penalty by an arbitral or judicial authority or a judicial pronouncement or arbitration award against the Bidder including individual or any of its Joint Venture Member, as the case may be. nor has been expelled or terminated by Ministry of Road Transport & Highways or its implementing agencies for breach by such Bidder including individual or any of its Joint Venture Member."*** **is non-responsive as** ***the project i.e*** **"Rehabilitation and up-gradation of Doimukh-Harmuti road from Harmuti Junction (0/00 km) to Khula camp (14/370 km) and Doimukh (0/000 km) to Bagh Tinali (3/100 km) two lane carriageway in the State of Assam and Arunachal Pradesh on EPC basis"** ***has been terminated on 14.03.2016 by the NHAI on account of breach of the contract, which is within the period of 2 years as mentioned in clause 2.1.19 of the RFP.. Therefore, the bid of M/s Progressive Constructions is considered non responsive.***

10. Recommendation of the Empowered Technical bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC): The committee is of the view that out of the Seven bidders only Six bidders are fulfilling the eligibility criteria prescribed in the RFP, therefore the financial bids of the following Six bidders be opened with the approval of the Competent Authority.

1.	M/s RMN-KMV Joint Venture
2.	M/s. T. K. Engineering Consortium Pvt. Ltdin JV with Brand Eagles
3.	M/s. Sushee Infra & Mining Limited
4.	M/s Madhucon Projects Limited

5.	M/s PRL Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.
6.	M/s K R Anand in JV with KRA Infrastructure Developers Pvt. Ltd.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

(V.K.Rajawat) (ED-I) Chairman	(Y.C.Srivastava) (GM-Tech) Member Secretary	Adil Singh (GM-Tech) Member	A.K Jha DGM (Tech) Member	Sunil Gupta (Manager-Fin.) Member