

## No. NHIDCL/ Nagaland /Civil Work/Kohima Bypass/Pkg-1/2021

Date: 17.09.2021

То

All Respective Bidders,

Subject: Re-award of construction of two lane with paved shoulder of Kohima- Bypass Road connecting NH-39 (New NH-02), NH-150(New NH-02), NH- 61(New NH-29) and NH-39 (New NH-02) from Design Km 0.00 to design Km 10.500 [Design Length - 10.500 Km] in the state of Nagaland Under SARDP-NE on EPC Mode (Package I)

Reference Tender IDs: 2021\_NHIDC\_644649\_1

Sir,

Please refer to bid submitted for the subject cited above. The following is the result of technical evaluation. The minutes of technical evaluation is enclosed.

S. No.	Name of Bidders	Status		
1.	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	Technically Responsive		
2.	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive		

2. Financial bid of technical responsive bidders shall be opened on 20.09.2021 at 1500 hrs in NHIDCL, HQ, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, PTI building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

Encl: - As Stated above.

## National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2<sup>nd</sup> Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for "Re-award of construction of two lane with paved shoulder of Kohima- Bypass Road connecting NH-39 (New NH-02), NH-150(New NH-02), NH- 61(New NH-29) and NH-39 (New NH-02) from Design Km 0.00 to design Km 10.500 [Design Length - 10.500 Km] in the state of Nagaland Under SARDP-NE on EPC Mode (Package I)" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at on 16.09-2021.

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 14.09.2021 at 1100 hrs.

- 2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.
  - (i) M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania
  - (ii) M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd.

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of Rs 204.72 Crore.

Sr.No.	Particulars Amou Cr.				
1	Estimated Project Cost	204.72			
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	204.72			
3	Minimum required amount of COMPLETED Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least one similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii)				
4	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) )				
5	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).			
6	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) )	10.24			
7	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	10.24			
8	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	30.71			
9	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	102.36			

4. The Evaluation Committee during evaluation found that some of the data/information provided by the Bidders are not adhering to the clauses given in the RFP document, so it was proposed that the clarification may be sought from the Bidders as per clause no 3.1.4 of the RFP to facilitate the evaluation process. Accordingly, the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) in its meeting has decided that the clarification as requested by the Technical Division is to be sought from the respective bidders.

Page 1 of 6

5. In Continuation to 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) held on 15.09.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 16.09.2021. Some of the bidder has not given the year wise break up of receivable value for civil work reflected in the UDIN Certificate however the value given by the statutory Auditor have been considered. The remarks of ETEC w.r.t the observations and reply received are tabulated below:

S.N o	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought	Reply received by the	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	(i) As per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) (b) "When longest span is more than 60 m: 50% of the longest span or 100 m, whichever is less, of the structure proposed in this project". As per referred clause, the mandatory experience related to bridge is required to be fulfilled of single Span 40 meters. The details of such experience related to span length is not found in the submitted bid. The GAD of the bridge completed and certificate from authority regarding largest span may be submitted. Please Clarify.	i) The bidder has submitted authority letter which depict span length of the bridge.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
2	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd	(i) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not depict the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify.	i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for the turnover values.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

6. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the above bidders are as Annexure -1.

7. The **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** in its 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting has discussed the evaluation and after deliberation status of evaluation is as below.

m

Page 2 of 6

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive	0

8. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 2 (Two) technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahluwalia (ED) Chairman

R.S. Puri (GM-Tech) Member

(GM-Tech) Member

Bhaskar Mallick Manager -Finance Member

## Annexure - I

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs. 204.72 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause- 2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs.30.71 Cr.	Span Length of the Bridge (50% of the longest span) i.e. 40 meters
1	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	230.59 Cr	Yes (Rs 70.98 Cr)	41 meter
2	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd	255.20 Cr	Yes (Rs 60.33 Cr)	40 meter

		Summary o	f Financial Ev	aluation		
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 10.24 Crores)		
1.	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	SE	-	36.84 Cr	121.77 Cr	Y
2.	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd	SE	-	43.25 Cr	143.87 Cr	Y

			Statement	of Bid Capac	city Assessm	ient				
		Minimum	Requiremer	nt of Bid Caj	pacity = Rs.	102.36 (	Crore			
	Calculated / Assessed									
S No	Name of the Applicant	Financial / Calendar Year for which "A" has been claimed	Updation factor	Annual Turnover (Rs. Cr.)	A (Annual Turnover x Updation factor) Rs. Cr.	N	B (Rs. Cr.)	A x N x 2.5 - B (Rs. Cr.)	Whether Qualifying or Not	
1	M/s Ganesh Ram Dokania	2019-20	1.00	225.54	225.54	1.5	284. 88	560.90	Y	
2	M/s Vallabhaneni Construction Pvt. Ltd.	2016-17	1.15	147.09	169.15	1.5	137. 21	497.12	Y	