

# राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग एवं अवसंरचना विकास निगम लिमिटेड

सड़क परिवहन और राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार  
तीसरी मंजिल, पीटीआई बिल्डिंग, 4-संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001



**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 23461600, www.nhidcl.com

(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

(A Government of India Enterprise)

**NHIDCL/Procurement/Nagaland/2023-24-Part(2)/1969**

**Date: 12.02.2024**

To,

All Bidders

**Sub:** Construction of RCC Box Cell Viaduct by Box Pushing Method at chainage Km 157+200 to Km 157+500 along with other ancillary works on NH-29 in the State of Nagaland under SARDP-NE through Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) Contract Basis- **Result of Technical Evaluation- Reg.**

**Ref.:** Your bid submitted on 20.12.2023

Please refer to your bid submitted for the subject cited above. The following is the final result of technical evaluation:

S. No.	Name of the bidder	Responsiveness	Local Supplier Status	Remarks
(i)	M/s Brand Eagles	Technically Non-Responsive as per Cl. 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2 (iii) (c) of RFP.	Class-I Local Supplier	The bidder does not have experience in similar work and required Bid Capacity. Refer para 1 of Annexure for details.
(ii)	M/s Phoenix Engineering – M/s RAK Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Technically Non-Responsive as per Cl. 2.2.2.2 (i), 2.2.2.3 (i), 2.2.2.4 (i) and 3.1.6.1 of RFP	LM: Non-Local Supplier OM: Class-I Local Supplier	The Bidder does not fulfill minimum technical threshold capacity requirement and Financial Capacity requirement. Refer para 2 of Annexure for details.
(iii)	M/s Nithin Sai Constructions – M/s G Koteswara Rao (JV)	Technically Non-Responsive as per Cl. 2.2.2.2 (iii) (c) of RFP	Class-I Local Supplier	The bidder does not have experience in similar work. Refer para 3 of Annexure for details.
(iv)	M/s Jandu Construction India – M/s R. S. Construction Co. (JV)	Technically Non-Responsive as per Cl. 2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.2 (iii) (c) and 2.2.2.4 (i) of RFP	Class-I Local Supplier	The Lead member does not fulfill minimum bid capacity requirement and also, the bidder does not have experience in similar work. Refer para 4 of Annexure for details.

2. As per Cl. 2.19 of RFP, the bidders may submit their representations, in case of any objection, within 07 days from the date of uploading of Technical result (i.e. on or before 19.02.2024) on official email ID as mentioned in RFP.

  
Ashok Kumar Jha  
General Manager (Tech.)

Detailed Reasons for Non-Responsiveness

**1. M/s Brand Eagles**

The bidder, M/s Brand Eagles does not have similar work experience of 20% of EPC having minimum 75 mr. of total length of viaduct with 30.8 mtr. cross sectional area and 37.5 mtr. minimum pushing at one place. The bidder had claimed one project of Major Bridge having length 140 mtrs. However, it is not clearly specify whether the bridge is executed through Box Push method. Also, the cross sectional area and minimum pushing at one place are not indicated in the client certificate. Further, the cost of the project is Rs. 14.44 which is less than the requirement of Rs. 18.004 Cr. Moreover, the bidder does not fulfil the minimum bid capacity as required under Cl. 2.2.2.1 of RFP, since the bidder M/s Brand Eagles has been declared as L-1 bidder in two projects of NHIDCL namely (i) Tato-Manigong (Rs. 299.86 Cr) and (ii) Zido-Singha (Rs. 340.90 Cr) of NH-913 in the state of Arunachal Pradesh. Thus, the bid price quoted by the bidder, M/s ABCI Infrastructures Pvt. Ltd. - M/s Brand Eagles (JV) for the above two work are also taken into consideration for evaluation of Value of 'B' as per RFP. The updated Bid Capacity of the bidder is Rs. (-) 246.29 Cr against the minimum requirement of Rs. 90.02 Cr. Accordingly, the bidder does not fulfill the minimum required Bid Capacity of 20% of Estimated Project Cost. Accordingly, the bidder, M/s Brand Eagles is non-responsive as per Cl. 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2 (iii) (c) of RFP.

**2. M/s Phoenix Engineering - M/s RAK Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)**

The bidder has not submitted following documents:

- i. Appendix-III (Power of Attorney for signing the BID) by both lead member & JV member in the technical bid on CPP portal. In addition to above, the other member has not submitted Appendix-III (PoA) physically.
- ii. Annexure-VIII (Details of on-going work) by lead member i.e. M/s Phoenix Engineering.
- iii. Appendix-X (Certificate of Net Worth by Statutory Auditor) of lead member i.e. M/s Phoenix Engineering.

(iv) Appendix-XI (Certificate of Turn Over by Statutory Auditor) of lead member i.e. M/s Phoenix Engineering.

Also, the bidder, M/s Phoenix Engineering - M/s RAK Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV), the lead member, M/s Phoenix Engineering does not fulfill the minimum threshold technical capacity of 60% of Estimated Project Cost as required under Clause 2.2.2.2 (i) and 2.2.2.4 (i) of RFP. The lead member has submitted 08 nos. of projects of Rs. 51.75 Cr. for claiming technical experience under Cl. 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP. After assessment, the total eligible technical experience works out to be Rs. 16.49 Cr against the minimum requirement of Rs. 40.509 Cr. Also, the pages containing value of B in the bid of M/s Phoenix Engineering to calculate the bid capacity is not legible.



Further, the other member, M/s RAK Projects Pvt. Ltd. does not fulfil the minimum net worth as required under Clause 2.2.2.3 (i) and 2.2.2.4 (i) of RFP i.e Rs. 0.90 Cr. The JV member has claimed net worth for the F.Y. 2022-23, whereas its lead member has claimed net worth for the F.Y. 2021-22. Accordingly, F.Y. 2021-22 has been considered for evaluation of this bidder. Hence, the other member has net worth of Rs. (-) 4.34 Cr. in the F.Y. 2021-22.

**3. M/s Nithin Sai Constructions - M/s G Koteswara Rao (JV)**

The bidder, M/s Nithin Sai Constructions - M/s G Koteswara Rao (JV) does not have similar work experience of 20% of EPC having minimum 75 m of total length of viaduct with 30.8 m cross sectional area and 37.5 mtr. minimum pushing at one place. The other member, M/s G Koteswara Rao has claimed one project i.e. code '2a' having length 112 m, project cost Rs. 28.09 Cr. However, in the client certificate, it is mentioned that the RCC Box was conducted through Air-pushing method which is not acceptable as per RFP. Also, the cross sectional area and minimum pushing at one place is not been indicated.

**4. M/s Jandu Construction India - M/s R. S. Construction Co. (JV)**

The bidder, M/s Jandu Construction India - M/s R. S. Construction Co. (JV), does not fulfil the minimum bid capacity as required under Cl. 2.2.2.1 of RFP. As per assessment, the lead member has total bid capacity of Rs. 26.50 Cr against the minimum requirement of Rs. 54.01 Cr and the other member has total bid capacity of Rs. 17.37 Cr. against the minimum requirement of Rs. 18.00 Cr.

Further, the bidder does not have similar work experience of 20% of EPC having minimum 75 m of total length of viaduct with 30.8 m cross sectional area and 37.5 m minimum pushing at one place. The other member, M/s G Koteswara Rao had claimed 04 projects i.e. code 'A', 'B', 'C' & 'D'. However, all the projects are not eligible as per Cl. 2.2.2.2 (iii) (c) of RFP as mentioned below:

(i) Project code 'A' is not eligible as the project cost is less than 20% of estimated project cost.

(ii) Project code 'B' is not eligible as the bridge was conducted through Air pushing method instead of Box Push method which is not as per RFP. Also, length of the bridge, cross sectional area and minimum pushing at one place are not indicated in the client certificate.

(iii) Project code 'C' is not eligible as the cross sectional area of the bridge is less than the requirement i.e. 30.8 sq. m. Also, length of the bridge and minimum pushing at one place are not indicated in the client certificate.

(iv) Project code 'D' is not eligible as the minimum pushing at one place is less than the requirement i.e. 37.5 m.