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
BHARATMALA ROAD TO PROSPERITY
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - BUILDING THE NATION
CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062
(भारत सरकार का उद्यम) (A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/AP/Hunli-Anini/Major bridge /2021 **Date: 13.05.2021**

To

All Respective Bidders,

Subject:- Construction of Two Major bridges at Existing Ch. 23+650 (designed Ch. 23+550) and Ch. 28+200 (designed Ch. 28+200) of bridge span 160 m along the Existing Hunli-Anini Road from Km 21.500 to Km 37.500 in the State of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode under SARDP- **Opening of Financial bids-Reg.**

Reference Tender ID: **2021_NHIDC_620222_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:

Sr.N	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s Buru Enterprises	Technically Responsive
2	M/s Tama Fabrications	Technically Non-Responsive
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive

2. Financial bid of technically responsive bidders shall be opened on 18.05.2021 at 1500 hrs.

Encl: As above

Yours faithfully,

(A.K.Jha)

General Manager (T)

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for: "**Construction of Two Major bridges at Existing Ch. 23+650 (designed Ch. 23+550) and Ch. 28+200 (designed Ch. 28+200) of bridge span 160 m along the Existing Hunli-Anini Road from Km 21.500 to Km 37.500 in the State of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode under SARDP.**" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at **on 23.04.2021.**

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online and submit the hard bound documents on scheduled bid due date as 12.04.2021.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

(i) M/s Buru Enterprises
(ii) M/s Tama Fabrications
(iii) M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 45.43 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	45.43
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	22.72
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)	13.63
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)	4.54
5	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)	9.09
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))	2.27
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))	2.27
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	2.27
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.36
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	0.45
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	6.81
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	4.09
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.36
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	22.72
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	13.63

17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	4.54

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 first meeting had decided that the clarification as requested by the Technical Division is to be sought from the respective bidders.

5. In Continuation to 1st Meeting of **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** held on 16.04.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 23.04. 2021.Some of the bidders have not given the year wise break up of receivable value for civil work reflected in the UDIN Certificate, therefore 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.No	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought	Reply received from the bidder	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s Buru Enterprises	(i) As per the document submitted the balance sheet for five years has been audited by Mr. Anup Agrawala, whereas Appendix X,XI,IV,VI and the documents uploaded in UDIN on ICAI Portal are done by Mr Mrinmoy Pathak. Please clarify.	*(i)* The bidder clarifies that "*We would like to state that the Audit and Balance sheet unto Financial Year 2019-20 was conducted and prepared respectively by CA Mr. Anup Agarwala. Therefore, (thereafter) my client M/s BURU ENTERPRISE has appointed me as a Statutory auditor since (from) 1st Apil2020 till date. For the tender purpose, we prepared the mentioned Annexures Namely IV, VI, and Appendix XI and Appendix XII and documents as required during the said year with MORTH, NHAI, NHIDCL and Airport Authority and other State PWDs being*	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed that via letter dated 16.11.2020 that the bidder has appointed AMD & Associate (Firm Reg no. 0318191E) C.A. Mrinmoy Pathak (Partner) as Statutory Auditor the of the firm from 1st April 2020. The balance sheet for FY 2015-16,2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 were audited by CA Anup Agarwala. The committee deliberated the issue and decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive

			appointed as the Statutory Auditor for FY 2020-21 and to undertake interim certification work.	
		(ii) whether ICAI has been reported for the forgement practice done by Mr. Mintu Bhattacharjee? If yes, a copy of the same may be attached	(ii) The bidder has submiited the emails to the ICAI dated 26.10.2020 regarding the forgement practice done by Mr. Mintu Bhattacharjee, C.A.	
		(iii) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify.	(iii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm.	
		(iv) Cost of bridge is required for consideration of similar Project. Please clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted the Completion certificate from the authority which gives the actual cost Cost of the bridge.	
		(v) 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. 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 along with cost of bridge project claimed. Please Clarify.	(v) The bidder has submitted the GAD of the bridge.	
2	M/s Tama Fabrications	(i) Annexure 1 Details of bidder is not as per RFP Format Please clarify (ii) Appendix- IA Annexure IV UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise breakup of	i) The bidder has submitted Annexure 1 as per RFP format. ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed by the committee that the bidder has experience of single span of maximum length of 45

		receivable values all eligible projects. Please clarify. (iii) Appendix x net worth values are described in Lakhs but as per UDIN on ICAI portal the values are in Crore. Please clarify. (iv) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify. (v) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify. (vi) Birfucation of Revenue from operation is required as per audited balance sheet for all five years revenue is described by sum of contact works and sales. Please clarify. (vii) Cost of bridge is required for consideration of similar Project. Please clarify. (viii) 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. 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 along with the cost of	breakup of receivable values in UDIN on ICAI portal. iii) The bidder has submitted corrected UDIN number which reflects the units same as per Appendix x in UDIN on ICAI portal. iv) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflect year wise turnover in UDIN on ICAI portal. v) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm. vi) The bidder has submitted Bifurcation of Revenue from operation. vii) The bidder has submitted letter from the authority which refer Cost of bridge. viii) The bidder has submitted GAD of the bridge.	meter but as per RFP the required single span length is 80 meter which is less. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive

		the bridge work. Please Clarify.		
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	(i) Project code A and K submitted for eligible projects for Appendix-IA Annexure IV UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise breakup of receivable values. Please clarify. (ii) Project code B to J submitted for eligible projects for Appendix-IA Annexure IV UDIN could not be located. Please clarify. (iii) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Appendix X, XI are not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (v) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify. (vi) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the Net worth. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise breakup of receivable values in UDIN on ICAI portal. (ii) Bidder has submitted UDIN number for eligible projects. (iii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm. (iv) The bidder has submitted Appendix X, XI as per RFP format. (v) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflects year wise turnover in UDIN on ICAI portal. (vi) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflects Net worth of the firm.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. 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 -I.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s Buru Enterprises	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Tama Fabrications	**Technically Non-Responsive**	0
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	1

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 Ahulwalia
(ED-I)
Chairman

B. Shivprasad
(GM-Tech)
Member

A.K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member

Bhaskar Mallaick
(Manager -Finance)
Member