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

NHIDCL
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - BUILDING THE NATION
CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062

(भारत सरकार का उद्यम) (A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/Nagaland//Peren Dimapur/ Pkg 4/ 2021 /789 11.03.2021

To

All the Technically Qualified Bidders

Sub: Construction of 2 Laning with Hard Shoulder of Peren - Dimapur section on NH - 129A from Design Km 163.592 to Km 173.850 (Length - 10.258 Km) in the state of Nagaland on EPC mode (Pkg - IV) under NH (O) - TSP - ***Opening of financial bid - reg.***

Based on the Technical Evaluation, following is the evaluation result of bidders for the subject project:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Non Responsive	0
4	M/s Vertex Construction	Technically Responsive	0
5	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	Technically Responsive	0
6	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
7	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive	0
8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Technically Responsive	1 - Manipur (CMAT & AKMB)
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	Technically Responsive	1 - Arunachal Pradesh
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	Technically Responsive	0
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	Technically Responsive	0
13	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Responsive	1 - Manipur
14	M/s Multi Builders	Technically Responsive	1 - Nagaland
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
16	M/s Mena Traders	Technically Responsive	0

2. A copy of the 2nd Minutes of Meeting of the Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) is also enclosed herewith for information of applicant bidders.

3. Accordingly, Financial bid of technically responsive bidders shall be opened on 15.03.2021 at 1100 Hrs in NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi - 110001

Encl: As above.

(A. K. Jha)
General Manager (Technical)
Email: gmnagaland.nhidcl@gmail.com

1484776/2021/Technical

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for "Construction of 2 Laning with Hard Shoulder of Peren - Dimapur section on NH - 129A from Design Km 163.592 to Km 173.850 (Length - 10.258 Km) in the state of Nagaland on EPC mode (Pkg - IV) under NH (O) - TSP" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at on 22.02-2021.

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 18.01.2021.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

(i) M/s Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.
(ii) M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited
(iii) M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.
(iv) M/s Vertex Construction
(v) M/s Sri Harsha Constructions
(vi) M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.
(vii) M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises
(viii) M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)
(ix) M/s LNS Infrastructures
(x) M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.
(xi) M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari
(xii) M/s Trident Enterprises
(xiii) M/s Satya Builders
(xiv) M/s Multi Builders
(xv) M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.
(xvi) M/s Mena Traders

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 85.64 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	85.64
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	42.82
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)	25.69
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)	8.56
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)	12.85
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))	4.28
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))	4.28
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	4.28

1484776/2021/Technical

10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.57
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	0.86
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	12.85
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.71
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.57
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	42.82
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	25.69
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	8.56

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. In Continuation to 1st Meeting of **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** held on 04.02.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 22.02.2021.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.No	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought	Reply received by the bidder	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	(i) Appendix IA Annexure I not in RFP format. Please Clarify (ii) Statutory Certificate of project code "J" Could not be located. Please Clarify. (iii) Appendix IA Annexure VI could not be located. Please Clarify. (iv) Audited Balance sheet for FY 2016-17 could not be located. Please Clarify. (v) Profit and Loss Statement of Audited Balance for FY 2018-19 could not be located. Please Clarify	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix IA Annexure I as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted Statutory Certificate of project code "J". (iii) The bidder has submitted Appendix IA Annexure VI as per RFP format. (iv) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance sheet for FY 2016-17. (v) The bidder has submitted Profit and Loss Statement of Audited Balance for FY 2018-19.	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.

		(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) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit. (viii) Project code 'O' authority certificate is not located. Please Clarify.	(vi) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. (vii) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format. (viii) The bidder has submitted authority certificate for Project code 'O'.	
2	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	(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. (ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	(i) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. (ii) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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.
3	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	(i) Appendix IA Annexure VI could not be located. Please Clarify. (ii) Authority Certificate for Project Code 'B to E' could not be located. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix IA Annexure VI. (ii) The bidder has submitted Authority Certificate for Project Code 'B to E'.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. Committee observed that the bidder has not provided the sub Contactor Certificate from the Competent Authority for Project Code B to E. As per RFP Clause Appendix IA Annexure VI (7) stated

		(iii) 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.	(iii)The bidder has submitted Annex-IV as per RFP format.	that "*In case of projects in Categories 1and 2, particulars such as name, address and contact details of owner/ Authority/ Agency (i.e. concession grantor, counter party to concession,etc.) may be provided. In case of projects in Categories 3 and 4, similar particulars of the client need to be provided with the details whether the work was Executed as main contractor or sub-contractor. In case the work has been executed as a sub-contractor of the main contractor, approval of the Authority must be submitted along with the bid*". Accordingly only one project has been considered for the evaluation. Further, it was bought to the Kind notice of the committee that the bidder has Threshold Technical Capacity of Rs. 28.67 Cr but as per RFP Section 7 Data Sheet Guidance Note (Note no 2 (1)) the Threshold Technical Capacity for the bidder should be Rs. 42.82 Cr. Since the bidder has not fulfilled the required Threshold Technical Capacity the bid can be considered as Technically Non Responsive.
4	M/s Vertex Construction	(i) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	(i) The bidder has Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity, it has been observed that TAN number have not been provided by the bidder.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed that the bidder has not provided the TAN No. of Authority in C.A Certificate as required vide Annex-IV of Appendix-IA.

		(ii) For all Project submitted for Annex - IV, year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work is not reflected in UDIN ICAI certificate. Please clarify. (iii) 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.	(ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work for all Projects. (iii) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	However, Committee noted that the bidder has worked as main contractor in all the projects Code specified and has submitted the certificates from the authority, which are the Govt. agencies for some of the requisite projects. Further bidder has not submitted the TAN no. from the concerned agencies. Committee deliberated on the issue and since bidder has worked as main contractor and submitted certificates from the Government Authorities. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
5	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	(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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	(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. (ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	i) The bidder has submitted the Authority certificate for consideration of single work under category 1 & 3. (ii) The bidder has submitted Appendix IA Annexure VI.	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.

		(iii) Net worth of FY 2019-20 as per Audited Balance sheet and Appendix x is Rs 8.19 Cr. but as per UDIN on ICAI Portal the Net Worth is Rs 9.68 Cr. Please Clarify.	iii) The bidder clarifies that *"there was some typing mistake by article assistance/staff while mentioning the UDIN number 20091598AAAALL6725 on the Net Worth of M/s SKV Infratech Private Limited, so we humbly apologize for the same and enclosing the same certificate with correct UDIN 21091598AAAAAQ8796 which was generated on that day but mistakenly not mentioned."* Accordingly, the corrected UDIN number submitted by the bidder have been considered which reflect Net worth of Rs 8.19 Cr. on UDIN ICAI Portal.	
		(iv) Reference number from bank for submission of cost of Bid does not match with our records. Please clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted Reference number from bank for cost of Bid.	
7	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	(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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. Committee observed that the bidder has Threshold Technical Capacity of Rs. 30.74 Cr but as per RFP Section 7 Data Sheet Guidance Note (Note no 2 (1)) the Threshold Technical Capacity for the bidder should be Rs. 42.82 Cr. Since the bidder has not fulfilled the required Threshold Technical Capacity the bid can be considered as Technically Non Responsive.
		(ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	(ii) The bidder has Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity, it has been observed that bidder still not provide TAN number and name of the firm from Statutory Auditor.	
		(iii) Appendix I Annexure III is not as per RFP Format. Please	(iii) The bidder has submitted Appendix I Annexure as per RFP Format.	

		clarify and re submit. (iv) Audited Balance sheet for FY 2015-16 could not be located. Please Clarify	(iv) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance sheet for FY 2015-16.	
8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	A. **M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd.** (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 (ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit. (iii) Project Code 'A to E' Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) For all Project submitted for Annex - IV, year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work is not reflected in UDIN ICAI certificate. Please clarify.	A. **M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd.** (i) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. (ii) The bidder clarifies that *"the matter has been taken up with the Chartered Accountant and is expected to get the desired documents certified shortly. Kindly bear this time and allow us to submit the same at the earliest."* (iii) The bidder has submitted Authority Certificate for project code A,B,C,E which have been considered. (iv) Bidder clarifies that " *Each UDIN is generate in the respective portal initiated by the C.A. in Putting his specific identification based on its brief description and salient numerical data as will be evident in the respective certificate. So year wise breakup of all the related data are not required for*	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was observed that the bidder has not provided the TAN No. Of Authority in C.A Certificate as required vide Annex-IV of Appendix-IA. However, Committee noted that the bidder has worked as main contractor in all the projects Code specified and has submitted the certificates from the authority, which are the Govt. agencies for some of the requisite projects. Further bidder has not submitted the TAN no. From the concerned agencies. Committee deliberated on the issue and since bidder has worked as main contractor and submitted certificates from the Government Authorities. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

			this purpose. It stands as authentication of issuance of a certificate by regd. Charter Accountant".	
		(v) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify.	(v) Bidder clarifies that *" it is same as in Point (iv) above, Generally, one or two data are provided by C.A. to generate UDIN for authentication of the issuance of concerned certificate to the chances of getting all five years information in the concerned UDIN are remote".*	
		B. M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd.	**B. M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd.**	
		(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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	
		(ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	(ii) The bidder clarifies that *"they have approached the authority to make this certificate and it is yet to be issued".*	
		(iii) Project Code 'B to F' Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify.	(iii) The bidder has submitted Authority certificate for Project Code B only which have been considered.	
		(iv) For all Project submitted for Annex - IV, year wise breakup of receivable value in	(iv) The bidder clarifies that *"The auditor has certified that it should be provided in the UDIN ICAI Portal".*	

		civil work is not reflected in UDIN ICAI certificate. Please clarify. (v) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify. (vi) Refer note number 11 could not be located from Audited Balance Sheet for FY 2018-19. Please Clarify.	(v) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict turnover of last 5 years (vi) The bidder ha submitted the Refer note number 11 of Audited Balance Sheet for FY 2018-19.	
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	(i) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit. (ii) Reference number from bank for submission of cost of Bid does not match with our records. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted Reference number from bank for cost of Bid.	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.
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	(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. (ii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the	(i) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. (ii) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format.	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.

		format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.		
		(iii) Authority Certificate for all projects submitted for Annex-IV could not be located. Please clarify.	(iii) The bidder has submitted Authority certificate for all projects.	
		(iv) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which despite turnover of last 5 years.	
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	(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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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.
		(ii) Authority Certificate for all projects submitted for Annex-IV could not be located. Please clarify.	(ii) The bidder has submitted Authority certificate for all projects.	
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	(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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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.
		(ii) Authority Certificate for project code "B" submitted for Annex-IV could not be located. Please clarify.	(ii) The bidder has submitted Authority Certificate for project code "B".	

		(iii) UDIN numbers for all submitted eligible projects are not located. Please clarify. (iv) UDIN number are not located on Appendix x, xi. Please Clarify.	(iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work for all Projects. (iv) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for Appendix x, xi.	
13	M/s Satya Builders	(i) For Project code "B,C,D,E" year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work is not reflected in UDIN ICAI certificate. 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. (iii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work for Project code "B,C,D,E". (ii) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. (iii) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format.	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.
14	M/s Multi Builders	(i) Appendix IA Annexure IV "amount received from Firm and TAN no "for all submitted projects could not be located. Please Clarify. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix IA Annexure IV which shows amount received from Firm and TAN no "for all submitted projects. (ii) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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.

		be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (iii) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit.	(iii) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format.	
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	(i) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit. (ii) For all Project submitted for Annex - IV, year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work is not reflected in UDIN ICAI certificate. Please clarify. (iii) 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 Annex - IV as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise breakup of receivable value in civil work for all Projects. (iii) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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.
16	M/s Mena Traders	(i) Annex - IV, details of Eligible projects for Technical Threshold Capacity is not as per the format of RFP. Please clarify and re submit. (ii) For consideration of single work under	(i) The bidder has submitted Annex - IV as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted the experience	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

		category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	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 Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Non Responsive	0
4	M/s Vertex Construction	Technically Responsive	0
5	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	Technically Responsive	0
6	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
7	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive	0
8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Technically Responsive	1 - Manipur (CMAT & AKMB)
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	Technically Responsive	1 - Arunachal Pradesh
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	Technically Responsive	0
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	Technically Responsive	0
13	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Responsive	1 - Manipur
14	M/s Multi Builders	Technically Responsive	1 - Nagaland
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
16	M/s Mena Traders	Technically Responsive	0

9. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 14 (Fourteen) 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	Sandeep Kumar Manager -Finance Member

Annexure - I

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs. 42.82 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause-2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 12.85 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 25.368 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 8.456 Cr.
1	M/s Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	220.71 Cr	Yes (Rs 31.43 Cr)	NA	NA
2	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	128.09 Cr	Yes (Rs 68.54 Cr)	NA	NA
3	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	28.67 Cr	Yes (Rs 28.67 Cr)	NA	NA
4	M/s Vertex Construction	75.52 Cr	Yes (Rs 13.57 Cr)	NA	NA
5	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	55.81 Cr	Yes (Rs 17.49 Cr)	NA	NA
6	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	128.75 Cr	YES (Rs 40.95 Cr)	NA	NA
7	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	30.74 Cr	Yes (Rs 27.94 Cr)	NA	NA
8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	NA	Yes (Rs 19.98 Cr)	211.68 Cr	80.20 Cr
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	102.95 Cr	Yes (Rs 102.95 Cr)	NA	NA
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	378.25 Cr	Yes (Rs 63.19 Cr)	NA	NA
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	60.96 Cr	Yes (Rs 12.86 Cr)	NA	NA
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	47.79 Cr	Yes (Rs 13.97 Cr)	NA	NA
13	M/s Satya Builders	235.19 Cr	Yes (Rs 41.18 Cr)	NA	NA
14	M/s Multi Builders	120.05 Cr	Yes (Rs 77.57 Cr)	NA	NA
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	172.33 Cr	Yes (Rs 104.80 Cr)	NA	NA
16	M/s Mena Traders	53.54 Cr	Yes (Rs 20.57 Cr)	NA	NA

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 4.28 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 12.85 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1.	M/s Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	23.82 Cr	60.46 Cr	Y
2.	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	SE	-	11.37 Cr	46.63 Cr	Y
3.	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	4.87 Cr	14.44 Cr	Y
4.	M/s Vertex Construction	SE	-	45.97 Cr	97.29 Cr	Y
5.	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	SE	-	6.90 Cr	22.13 Cr	Y
6.	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	8.19 Cr	59.53 Cr	Y
7.	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	SE	-	10.64 Cr	16.05 Cr	Y
8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd.	JV	51%-49%	Lead-65.92 Cr Other- 5.84 Cr	Lead-69.93 Cr Other- 13.10 Cr	Y
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	SE	-	6.36 Cr	23.11 Cr	Y
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	54.09 Cr	176.08 Cr	Y
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	SE	-	10.12 Cr	63.03 Cr	Y
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	SE	-	25.67 Cr	59.27 Cr	Y
13	M/s Satya Builders	SE	-	79.48 Cr	272.35 Cr	Y
14	M/s Multi Builders	SE	-	13.89 Cr	51.09 Cr	Y

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 4.28 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 12.85 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	6.50 Cr	55.95 Cr	Y
16	M/s Mena Traders	SE	-	10.79 Cr	149.90 Cr	Y

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment									
Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 42.82 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 Dwarakamai Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	2018	1.05	75.4	79.17	1.5	66.99	**229.90**	Yes
2	M/s Stone Concern Infrastructure Private Limited	2018	1.05	49.78	52.27	1.5	27.5	**168.51**	Yes
3	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2019	1	27.47	27.47	1.5	1.86	**101.15**	Yes
4	M/s Vertex Construction	2019	1	91.10	91.10	1.5	73.73	**267.90**	Yes
5	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	2018	1.05	30.48	32.00	1.5	21.77	**98.25**	Yes
6	M/s SKV Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2017	1.10	85	93.50	1.5	26.98	**323.65**	Yes
7	M/s Modern Engineering Enterprises	2014	1.20	29.5	35.4	1.5	0	**132.75**	Yes

8	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd. - M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd. (JV)								
	M/s Coal Mines Associated Traders Pvt. Ltd.	2018	1.05	93.72	98.41	1.5	184.77	184.25	Yes
	M/s AKMB Projects Pvt. Ltd.	2019	1	34.58	34.58	1.5	4.83	124.85	Yes
							Total	309.10	Yes
9	M/s LNS Infrastructures	2016	1.15	44.88	51.61	1.5	52.69	140.86	Yes
10	M/s AK Shivhare Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	2019	1	213.16	213.16	1.5	130.17	669.18	Yes
11	M/s Mungamuru Sri Hari	2018	1.05	84.65	88.88	1.5	89.75	243.56	Yes
12	M/s Trident Enterprises	2016	1.15	90.53	104.11	1.5	45.1	345.31	Yes
13	M/s Satya Builders	2018	1.05	267.16	280.53	1.5	71.49	980.49	Yes
14	M/s Multi Builders	2019	1	59.64	59.64	1.5	14.47	209.18	Yes
15	M/s Naagaamii Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2018	1.05	108.37	113.79	1.5	97.93	328.78	Yes
16	M/s Mena Traders	2015	1.20	31.47	37.76	1.5	0	141.62	Yes