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)

No. NHIDCL/Civil Work/A.P/ Foot Track/ Lamino to Longchu /2021/2573 **Date: 29.07.2021**

To

All Respective Bidders,

Subject:- **Construction of Foot Track from Lamino to Longchu from KM 0.000 to KM 60.514 in East Kameng in the state of Arunachal Pradesh on Engineering, Procurement and Construction (the "EPC") Mode.**

Reference Tender IDs: 2021_NHIDC_632501_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 Dagmo Riba	Technically responsive
2	M/s H.B. Enterprises	Technically responsive
3	M/s N.D Enterprises	Technically responsive
4	M/s Sunny Construction	Technically Non responsive
5	M/s J Anand Reddy	Technically Non responsive
6	M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)	Technically responsive
7	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	Technically responsive
8	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	Technically responsive
9	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	Technically responsive
10	M/s Kenge Construction	Technically Non responsive
11	M/s S.K Construction	Technically Non responsive
12	M/s Vivek Enterprises	Technically responsive
13	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	Technically responsive

14	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	Technically responsive
15	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	Technically responsive
16	M/s Jony Enterprises	Technically Non responsive

2. Financial bid of technical responsive bidders shall be opened on 02.08.2021 at 1500 hrs in NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd floor, PTI building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

Encl: - As Stated above.

A.K.Jha
GM(Tech)

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for: **"Construction of Foot Track from Lamino to Longchu from KM 0.000 to KM 60.514 in East Kameng in the state of Arunachal Pradesh on Engineering, Procurement and Construction (the "EPC") Mode"** held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at **on 28.07.2021.**

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 19.07.2021.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

(i) M/s Dagmo Riba
(ii) M/s Jony Enterprises
(iii) M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)
(iv) M/s Tamchi Kusuk
(v) M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency
(vi) M/s Vivek Enterprises
(vii) M/s S.K Construction
(viii) M/s Kenge Construction
(ix) M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited
(x) M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros
(xi) M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor
(xii) M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)
(xiii) M/s J Anand Reddy
(xiv) M/s Sunny Construction
(xv) M/s N.D Enterprises
(xvi) M/s H.B. Enterprises

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 79.17 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	79.17
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	39.59
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)	23.75
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)	7.92
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)	11.88
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))	3.96
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))	3.96
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	3.96

10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.38
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	0.79
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	11.88
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.13
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.38
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	39.59
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	23.75
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.92

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. It was bought to the notice of the Committee that M/s Jony Enterprises has submitted false documents in the project **"Construction of Foot Track from Goiliang village - Dudhakaru via Glotong la for total length of KM 15.500 to KM 87.91 in the state of Arunachal Pradesh on Engineering, Procurement and Construction (the "EPC") Mode" in the state of Arunachal Pradesh and the same documents have been submitted by the bidder in the above subject.** As per RFP section 2 clause 2.6.3 the bid of the M/s Jony Enterprise is considered as Non Responsive after the approval of the competent authority.

6. In Continuation to 1st Meeting of **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** held on 23.07.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 28.07.2021.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 TEC 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 H.B. Enterprises	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (iv) Annexure VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (v) As per Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2017-18 and FY 2016-17 the "Revenue from operation" values are Rs 65.26 Cr and Rs 57.75 Cr respectively but as per Appendix XI the Value of FY 2017-18 and FY 2016-17 is Rs 27.43 Cr and Rs 25.63 Cr. Please clarify (vi) Two Appendix X are submitted in the bid where in one	The bidder has not submitted clarification till date.	The committee deliberated the issue and observed the submitted bid and observed that the bidder has not submitted various Annexure I, II, III, VI, VIII as per RFP Format. The committee also observed that the bidder has submitted two Appendix X (Net Worth). Since the bidder has not submitted clarification with in time required and the bid has been evaluated based on the submitted

		Appendix X the Net worth of the Firm is Rs 18.13 Cr and in other the Net worth is Rs 16.57 Cr. Please clarify.		documents. Hence Committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
2	M/s Sunny Construction	(i) Appendix x, xi could not be located. Please Clarify. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X, XI as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder clarifies that "for consideration of single work we have successfully completed single work under category 1 & 3, as required by you, for the work allotted to us by NHAI for the project. Upgradation of NH- 353C Sakoli Wadsa-Armori-Gadchiroli section from Sakoli to Bhandara District border (Km 0.00 to 55.800) two lane/four lane with paved shoulder configuration in the state of Maharashtra. We have requested the NHAI authority for the said certificate. We assure you to submit the same in a short while.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed by the committee that the bidder has no similar work. As per RFP Clause 2.2.2.2 "at least one similar work of 15% of Estimated Project Cost shall have been completed from the Eligible Projects specified in Clause 2.2.2.5. For this purpose, a project shall be considered to be completed, if more than 90% of the value of work has been completed and such completed value of work is equal to or more than 15% of the estimated project cost". It was bought to the notice of the committee that as per RFP the Threshold Technical Capacity should be Rs 39.59 Cr and it was observed that the Threshold Technical Capacity of the firm is Rs 34.36 Cr which is less than the required. Since the bidder does not have any similar work the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive
3	M/s J Anand Reddy	(i) Annexure III (Net Cash Accrual) not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (ii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible	(i) The bidder has not submitted any clarification till date.	The committee deliberated the issue and observed that the bidder has not submitted various

		projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iii) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iv) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (v) Annexure V could not be located. Please clarify. (vi) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (vii) As per RFP section 7 Data Sheet the Threshold Technical Capacity should be Rs 39.59 Cr as per Annexure II submitted the Threshold Technical Capacity is Rs 28.38 Cr which is less than the required. Please clarify. (viii) POA could not be located. Please clarify. (ix) Proof for the submission of Cost of Bid could not be located. Please clarify.		Annexure III,IV,VI,V as per RFP format and Appendix X, XI as per RFP format and POA also not submitted. It was also bought to the notice of the committee that the bidder has not submitted Statutory Auditor certificate for Annexure IV. The committee also observed that the Appendix II submitted by the bidder claims Technical Threshold Capacity is to be Rs 28.38 Cr but as per RFP Section 7 Technical Threshold Capacity should be Rs 39.59 Cr which is less than the required. Since the bidder has not submitted the bid as per RFP also not replied to the clarification and also does not qualify for technical threshold capacity, Committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive
4	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	**a) M/s M.D Earthmovers** **(i)** For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify **b) M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction** **i)**For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify	(i) The bidder has submitted authority certificate for consideration of single work under category 1 & 3.	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
5	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted authority certificate for consideration of single work under category 1 &	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. Since the bidder is technically and financially

			3.	eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive
6	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	(i) Annexure V not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Annexure V as per RFP Format.	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
7	M/s Viva Infrastructure Private Limited	(i) As per Audited Balance sheet of FY 2019-20, FY 2018-19, FY 2017-18, FY 2016-17, FY 2015-16 the Turnover values are mentioned under "Other Operating Revenue" where as the Turnover values are to be from Civil Construction work. Please Clarify.	(i) The bidder clarifies that "We were submitting the Bid in Solely and we have already submitted the Appendix XI "Certificate of Turnover by Statutory Auditor" in this certificate serial no. 8, CA already certify that turnover mentioned in Para 5 is in respect of execution of Construction/Civil/Engineering Activities and does not include any trading activity".	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
8	M/s Kenge Construction	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III, IV not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (v) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (vi) Annexure V, VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (vii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the	(i) The bidder has submitted Annexure I as per RFP format. (ii) The Bidder has submitted Annexure II,III,IV as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder has submitted Annexure IV as per RFP format. (iv) The bidder has submitted Appendix X,XI as per RFP format. (v) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format. (vi) The bidder has submitted Annexure V, VIII, IX as per RFP format. (vii)The bidder has not submitted authority certificate from the authority for consideration of single	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed that the bidder has submitted Annexure II (Technical Capacity of the bidder) in which the bidder has submitted two projects are as follows (a) C/o Road from Parsi Parlo (Langbang) to Segriang (b) C/o PMGSY Road from LO l0 Road fiom Seppa to Rang (Stage- ll) The total Threshold Technical Capacity is Rs 24.82 Cr but as per

		page number and clarify.	work.	RFP section 7 the Threshold Technical Capacity should be Rs 39.59 Cr which is less than the required. It was also bought to the notice of the committee that the bidder has not submitted Statutory Auditor certificate for Annexure IV. The committee also observed that the bidder has not submitted authority certificate from the authority for consideration of single work. Since the bidder has not submitted the bid as per RFP format. Therefore, the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive
9	M/s S.K Construction	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III, IV not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (v) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (vi) Annexure V, VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (vii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (viii) Re submit Audited Balance	The bidder has not submitted any clarification till date.	The committee deliberated the issue and observed the submitted bid and observed that the bidder has not submitted Annexure I, II, III, IV, V,VI, VIII,IX as per RFP format. Since the bidder has not submitted Annexure IV certified by the Statutory Auditor which reflects year wise payment of the projects, due to which Technical Threshold capacity cannot be evaluated. The committee was informed that the bidder has not submitted Appendix X, XI as per RFP format. The Committee also observed That the

		Sheet of FY 2017-18, FY 2016-17, FY 2015-16 in clear print. (ix) Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 could not be located. If the Balance Sheet is not audited than the Undertaking needs to be submitted. Please clarify. (x) Reference number for the submission of cost of Bid could not be located. Please clarify		bidder has not submitted audited balance sheet of FY 2019-20 and Undertaking regarding non submission of Audited Balance sheet has not been submitted. Business turnover is from sales of good for FY 2018-19 but as per RFP Appendix XI the turnover should be of Execution of construction/Civil/Engineering activities which cannot be considered Since the bidder has not submitted the bid as per RFP format and the various documents were missing, and also not replied the clarification till date Therefore, the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive
10	M/s Vivek Enterprises	(i) Appendix X, XI could not be located. Please clarify. (ii) Re submit Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 in clear print.	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X, XI. (ii) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 in clear print.	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
11	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	(i) Profit and Loss statement/ Account of FY 2015-16 could not be located. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Profit and loss statement of FY 2015-16.	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

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

8. 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 Dagmo Riba	Technically responsive	0
2	M/s H.B. Enterprises	Technically responsive	0
3	M/s N.D Enterprises	Technically responsive	0
4	M/s Sunny Construction	**Technically Non responsive**	0
5	M/s J Anand Reddy	**Technically Non responsive**	0
6	M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)	Technically responsive	0
7	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	Technically responsive	0
8	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	Technically responsive	0
9	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	Technically responsive	0
10	M/s Kenge Construction	**Technically Non responsive**	0
11	M/s S.K Construction	**Technically Non responsive**	0
12	M/s Vivek Enterprises	Technically responsive	0
13	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	Technically responsive	Arunachal Pradesh=1
14	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	Technically responsive	0
15	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	Technically responsive	0
16	M/s Jony Enterprises	**Technically Non responsive**	

9. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 11 (Eleven) technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahulwalia
(ED)
Chairman

B. Shivprasad
(GM-Tech)
Member

A.K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member

Bhaskar Mallaick
Manager -Finance
Member

Annexure - I

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs.39.59 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause- 2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 11.88 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 23.75 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 7.92 Cr.
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	63.10 Cr	Yes (Rs 30.44 Cr)	NA	NA
2	M/s H.B. Enterprises	**43.17** Cr	Yes (Rs 14.82 Cr)	NA	NA
3	M/s N.D Enterprises	149.47 Cr	Yes (Rs 31.76 Cr)	NA	NA
4	M/s Sunny Construction	34.36 Cr	**No (Rs 0 Cr)**	NA	NA
5	M/s J Anand Reddy	**0 Cr**	**No (Rs 0 Cr)**	NA	NA
6	M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)	-	Yes (Rs 14.38 Cr)	76.39 Cr	20.59 Cr
7	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	99.28 Cr	Yes (Rs 17.65 Cr)	NA	NA
8	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	87.51 Cr	Yes (Rs 33.49 Cr)	NA	NA
9	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	68.03 Cr	Yes (Rs 38.50 Cr)	NA	NA
10	M/s Kenge Construction	**0 Cr**	**No (Rs 0 Cr)**	NA	NA
11	M/s S.K Construction	**0 Cr**	**No (Rs 0 Cr)**	NA	NA
12	M/s Vivek Enterprises	46.07 Cr	Yes (Rs 20.94 Cr)	NA	NA
13	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	41.97 Cr	Yes (Rs 14.40 Cr)	NA	NA
14	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	55.99 Cr	Yes (Rs 124.89 Cr)	NA	NA
15	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	-	Yes (Rs 20.94 Cr)	347.12 Cr	162.00 Cr
16	M/s Jony Enterprises	**Non Responsive**			

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Net Worth (in INR 3.96 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 11.88 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	SE		8.81 Cr	65.58 Cr	Y
2	M/s H.B. Enterprises	SE		16.57 Cr	42.61 Cr	Y
3	M/s N.D Enterprises	SE		15.44 Cr	29.88 Cr	Y
4	M/s Sunny Construction	SE		5.91 Cr	12.52 Cr	Y
5	M/s J Anand Reddy	SE		**6.49** Cr	20.82 Cr	Y
6	M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)	JV	51-49	Lead - 14.82 Cr Other-3.16 Cr	Lead- 51.67 Cr Other - 8.89 Cr	Y
7	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	SE		7.63 Cr	39.72 Cr	Y
8	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	SE		7.43 Cr	70.53 Cr	Y
9	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	SE		8.05 Cr	22.91 Cr	Y
10	M/s Kenge Construction	SE		48.86 Cr	76.78 Cr	Y
11	M/s S.K Construction	SE		5.09 Cr	**7.64 Cr**	N
12	M/s Vivek Enterprises	SE		12.45 Cr	43.44 Cr	Y

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Net Worth (in INR 3.96 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 11.88 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
13	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	SE		29.91 Cr	41.21 Cr	Y
14	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	SE		74.30 Cr	61.38 Cr	Y
15	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	JV	60-40	Lead - 9.10 Cr Other-3.72 Cr	Lead- 37.56 Cr Other - 16.11 Cr	Y
16	M/s Jony Enterprises	Non Responsive				

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment									
Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 39.59 Crore									
S No	Name of the Applicant	Calculated / Assessed							Whether Qualifying or Not
		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.)	
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	2018-19	1.05	63.01	66.16	1.5	2.98	**245.12**	Yes
2	M/s H.B. Enterprises	2019-20	1	51.56	51.56	1.5	26.50	**166.86**	**Yes**
3	M/s N.D Enterprises	2018-19	1.05	42.89	45.03	1.5	0	**168.88**	Yes
4	M/s Sunny Construction	2019-20	1	18.55	18.55	1.5	15.5	**54.06**	Yes
5	M/s J Anand Reddy	-	-	-	-	-	-	**0**	**NO**
6	M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)								
	M/s Shivsai Construction	2019-20	1	72.71	72.71	1.5	22.8	**249.86**	Yes
	M/s Rinya Yangfo	2018-19	1.1	11.39	12.53	1.5	3.6	**43.38**	Yes
							Total	**293.25**	
7	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	2019-20	1	46.8	46.8	1.5	37.37	**138.31**	Yes
8	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	2016-17	1.15	76.98	88.53	1.5	139.53	**192.45**	Yes

9	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	2015-16	1.20	34.27	41.12	1.5	0	**154.22**	Yes
10	M/s Kenge Construction	2019-20	1	131.92	131.92	1.5	21.69	**473.01**	**Yes**
11	M/s S.K Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	**0**	**NO**
12	M/s Vivek Enterprises	2019-20	1.00	47.99	47.99	1.5	0	**179.96**	Yes
13	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	2019-20	1.00	66.42	66.42	1.5	1.99	**247.09**	Yes
14	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	2015-16	1.20	98.84	118.61	1.5	39.14	**405.64**	Yes
15	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)								
	M/s M.D Earthmovers	2017-18	1.10	45.44	49.98	1.5	3.68	**183.76**	Yes
	M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction	2018-19	1.05	27.01	28.36	1.5	12.59	**93.76**	Yes
							Total	**277.52**	Yes
16	M/s Jony Enterprises	Non Responsive							

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for **"Construction of Foot Track from Lamino to Longchu from KM 0.000 to KM 60.514 in East Kameng in the state of Arunachal Pradesh on Engineering, Procurement and Construction (the "EPC") Mode"** held at NHIDCL, **New Delhi at 1500 Hrs on 23.07.2021**

1. The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 19.07.2021.

2. Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) met to open the technical Bids on 20.07.2021 at 1530 hrs. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

(i) M/s Dagmo Riba
(ii) M/s Jony Enterprises
(iii) M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)
(iv) M/s Tamchi Kusuk
(v) M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency
(vi) M/s Vivek Enterprises
(vii) M/s S.K Construction
(viii) M/s Kenge Construction
(ix) M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited
(x) M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros
(xi) M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor
(xii) M/s Shivsai Construction - M/s Rinya Yangfo (JV)
(xiii) M/s J Anand Reddy
(xiv) M/s Sunny Construction
(xv) M/s N.D Enterprises
(xvi) M/s H.B. Enterprises

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 79.17 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	79.17
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	39.59
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)	23.75
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)	7.92
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)	11.88
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))	3.96
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))	3.96
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	3.96

10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.38
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	0.79
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	11.88
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.13
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.38
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	39.59
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	23.75
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.92

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.

5. The details of bidders and the clarification to be sought are tabulated below:

S.No	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought
1	M/s H.B. Enterprises	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (iv) Annexure VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (v) As per Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2017-18 and FY 2016-17 the "Revenue from operation" values are Rs 65.26 Cr and Rs 57.75 Cr respectively but as per Appendix XI the Value of FY 2017-18 and FY 2016-17 is Rs 27.43 Cr and Rs 25.63 Cr. Please clarify (vi) Two Appendix X are submitted in the bid where in one Appendix X the Net worth of the Firm is Rs 18.13 Cr and in other the Net worth is Rs 16.57 Cr. Please clarify.
2	M/s Sunny Construction	(i) Appendix x, xi could not be located. Please Clarify. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.
3	M/s J Anand Reddy	(i) Annexure III (Net Cash Accrual) not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (ii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iii) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iv) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (v) Annexure V could not be located. Please clarify. (vi) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (vii) As per RFP section 7 Data Sheet the Threshold Technical Capacity should be Rs 39.59 Cr as per Annexure II submitted the Threshold Technical Capacity is Rs 28.38 Cr which is less than the required. Please clarify. (viii) POA could not be located. Please clarify.
4	M/s M.D Earthmovers - M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction (JV)	**a) M/s M.D Earthmovers** **(i)** For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify **b) M/s Madhavi Engineering Construction** **i)** For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the

		authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify
5	M/s Munish Kumar Bansal Contarctor	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.
6	M/s Paidala Tirupathi reddy & Bros	(i) Annexure V not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify.
7	M/s Viva Infraventure Private Limited	(i) As per Audited Balance sheet of FY 2019-20, FY 2018-19, FY 2017-18, FY 2016-17, FY 2015-16 the Turnover values are mentioned under "Other Operating Revenue" where as the Turnover values are to be from Civil Construction work. Please Clarify.
8	M/s Kenge Construction	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III, IV not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (v) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (vi) Annexure V, VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (vii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.
9	M/s S.K Construction	(i) Annexure I (Detail of bidder) is not submitted as per RFP Format. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure II, III, IV not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for Annexure IV for all eligible projects could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Appendix X, XI not submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (v) Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) could not be located. Please clarify (vi) Annexure V, VIII, IX could not be located. Please clarify. (vii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (viii) Re submit Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2017-18, FY 2016-17, FY 2015-16 in clear print. (ix) Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 could not be located. If the Balance Sheet is not audited than the Undertaking needs to be submitted. Please clarify.
10	M/s Vivek Enterprises	(i) Appendix X, XI could not be located. Please clarify. (ii) Re submit Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 in clear print.
11	M/s Tamchi Kusuk	(i) Profit and Loss statement/ Account of FY 2015-16 could not be located. Please clarify.

7. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) decided to ask for the above tabulated clarification after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahulwalia (ED) Chairman	B. Shivprasad (GM-Tech) Member	A.K. Jha (GM-Tech) Member	Bhaskar Mallaick Manager Finance Member