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/Assam/NH-29/Dab-Man/Pkg-2/2020/821 Date: 24.03.2021

Subject: "Widening/Improvement to 4 (Four) Lane with Paved Shoulder from KM 51+246to Km 66+000 (Design Chainage 50+710 to 65+923) of Parokhuwa - Dokmoka Section (Package 2) of NH 29 in the state of Assam on EPC mode"- **Result of Technical Evaluation of Bids reg.**

Reference: 2021_NHIDC_613023_1

Based on the evaluation of bids, the status of Technically Responsive/Non- Responsive of the participated bidders are as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Responsiveness
1.	M/s P.D. Agrawal Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Apex Structure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Technically Responsive
2.	M/s Mehta Construction Co.	Technically Responsive
3.	M/s JKM Infra Works LLP	Technically Responsive
4.	M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Technically Responsive
5.	M/s Buru Enterprises	**Technically Non-Responsive**
6.	M/s Allied Infrastructures & Projects Pvt. Ltd.	**Technically Non-Responsive**
7.	M/s Ganpati Builders	**Technically Non-Responsive**

2. Financial bid will be opened on 25.03.2021 at 1100 hrs at NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4 Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001

24/3/21
(K.C. Bhatt)

Dy. General Manager (Tech)

National Highway & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical division)

Minutes of Meeting of Technical Evaluation Committee held at NHIDCL HQ, New Delhi on the date 23.03.2021 **for "Widening/Improvement to 4 (Four) Lane with Paved Shoulder from KM 51+246to Km 66+000 (Design Chainage 50+710 to 65+923) of Parokhuwa - Dokmoka Section(Package 2) of NH 29 in the state of Assam on EPC mode".**

The RFP for the subject work were invited on 29.01.2021 with Bid due date 01.03.2021.

2. Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) opened the Technical Bids online through the CPP portal on 02.03.2021 at 1630 Hrs. No representative of the bidders attended the opening of the technical bids.

3. On opening of the bids online through CPP Portal, the Committee observed that total 7 (Seven) nos. of bids were received online on the CPP Portal against the subject project.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder
1	M/s P.D. Agrawal Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Apex Structure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)
2	M/s Mehta Construction Co.
3	M/s JKM Infra Works LLP
4	M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)
5	M/s Buru Enterprises
6	M/s Allied Infrastructures & Projects Pvt. Ltd.
7	M/s Ganpati Builders

4. In accordance with the Clause 2.15.2 of the RFP, the TEC opened and noted the receipt of following documents submitted by the bidders online through CPP Portal;

A. Bids Received on CPP Portal

Bidders Sr. no.	Name of Bidders	Details of document submitted as per RFP						
		Power of Attorney for Signing the bid if sole firm	Power of Attorney for the Lead Member of Joint Venture	Joint Bidding Agreement for Joint Venture	Bid Securing declaration	Integrity Pact (For work value of 100 Cr. not required)	Bid document Cost	Undertaking of the Person having POA that they agree and abide by the bid documents uploaded
1	M/s P.D. Agrawal Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Apex Structure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	M/s Mehta Construction Co.	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Bidders Sr. no.	Name of Bidders	Details of document submitted as per RFP						
		Power of Attorney for Signing the bid if sole firm	Power of Attorney for the Lead Member of Joint Venture	Joint Bidding Agreement for Joint Venture	Bid Securing declaration	Integrity Pact (For work value of 100 Cr. not required)	Bid document Cost	Undertaking of the Person having POA that they agree and abide by the bid documents uploaded
3	M/s JKM Infra Works LLP	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	M/s Buru Enterprises	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	M/s Allied Infrastructures & Projects Pvt. Ltd.	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	M/s Ganpati Builders	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

5. The Committee observed that all 7 (Seven) bidders submitted the bid document fees of Rs. 23,600/- (Rupees Twenty Three Thousand and Six Hundred only) through online mode (RTGS/NEFT/other online mode considering difficulty in its physical submission due to COVID-19 situation) on online bid submission date.

6. The Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of Rs. 172.91 Crore.

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount Rs. in Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	172.91
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	86.46
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)	51.87
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)	17.29
5	Minimum required amount of Completed Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least **One Similar Completed Work –15%** of Estimated Project Cost as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii)	25.94
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) I)	8.65
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))	8.65

9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3. (i)	8.65
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	5.19
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.73
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	25.94
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	15.56
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	5.19
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	86.46
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	51.87
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) .	17.29

7. Observations of the Committee:

The Committee observed that 1 bidder out of 7 (Seven) bidders, has submitted the financial capacity such as Net worth of FY 2018-19 and annual turnover from FY 2014-15 to FY2018-19 as the financial statements for the year ended 31st March 2020 are not prepared due to seizure of documents by the Income Tax Department during the search conducted in their premises on 22nd and 23rd December 2020. Accordingly, the Committee considered the financial statements for annual turnover from FY 2014-15 to 2018-19 since bidder has submitted the undertaking as per clause 2.2.2.8 (ii) of RFP.

8. As per the RFP, the Net worth of previous financial year and the Annual Average Turnover of the last five financial years certified by Statutory Auditor submitted in technical bid should be uploaded on UDIN portal of ICAI.

The Committee observed that UDIN certificate uploaded on the website in respect of one of the bidders did indicate turnover. The Committee decided to consider the values indicated in the certificate of the Statutory Auditor, which matched with the value of Audited Balance Sheet. However if any of other bidders becomes L1, then further verification if required can be done before award of the work.

9. After due deliberation TEC concluded that following three firms are not eligible for opening of their financial bids due to the reasons given against their name;

S.No.	Name of Bidders failing criteria	Reasons
1	M/s Buru Enterprises	1. The bidder has not submitted the Statement showing the value of all existing commitments, anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited and ongoing works as well as the stipulated period of completion remaining for each of the works mentioned in the table is verified from the certificate issued that has been countersigned by the Client or its Engineer- in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer or equivalent in respect of EPC Projects or Concessionaire / Authorised Signatory of SPV in respect of BOT Projects as per Annexure-VI of Appendix-1A of RFP. 2. Bidder has not submitted the certificate of Turnover and Net Worth issued by Statutory Auditor as per the format given in Appendix-X and Appendix-XI respectively. 3. The bidder furnished a different set of annual financial statements in bid for Daboka Manja package IV. In the view of the above it is found that bidder has not submitted the required necessary documents. Hence, bidder considered as non-responsive.

S.No.	Name of Bidders failing criteria	Reasons
2	M/s Allied Infrastructures & Projects Pvt. Ltd.	1. Bidder should submit the Statement showing the value of all existing commitments, anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited and ongoing works as well as the stipulated period of completion remaining for each of the works mentioned in the table is verified from the certificate issued that has been countersigned by the Client or its Engineer- in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer or equivalent in respect of EPC Projects or Concessionaire / Authorised Signatory of SPV in respect of BOT Projects as per Annexure-VI of Appendix-1A of RFP. For the same bidder has submitted copy of LOAs only. 2. Bidder has not submitted the certificate of Turnover and Net Worth issued by Statutory Auditor as per the format given in Appendix-X and Appendix-XI respectively. 3. Bidder has submitted audited financial statements of last five financial years but without notes to accounts as per Sl. no. 1(c) of Annexure-III of RFP. In the view of the above it is found that bidder has not submitted the required necessary documents. Hence, bidder considered as non-responsive.
3	M/s Ganpati Builders	As pert RFP Cl. 2.2.2.3 (i), the bidder should have a minimum Net Worth (the "Financial Capacity") of 5% (five percent) of the Estimated Project Cost at the close of the preceding financial year. Therefore required Net Worth is Rs. 8.65 Cr. However, Net Worth of the bidder claimed and assessed is Rs. 8.36 Cr. Since bidder has not met the required Net Worth, hence the bidder considered as non-responsive.

10. Based on the documents submitted by the bidders and their evaluation, the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) in its meeting has discussed and deliberated that the following bidders are found to be technically responsive/non-responsive:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Responsiveness
1	M/s P.D. Agrawal Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Apex Structure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Responsive
2	M/s Mehta Construction Co.	Responsive
3	M/s JKM Infra Works LLP	Responsive
4	M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV)	Responsive
5	M/s Buru Enterprises	**Non- Responsive**
6	M/s Allied Infrastructures & Projects Pvt. Ltd.	**Non- Responsive**
7	M/s Ganpati Builders	**Non- Responsive**

11. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the 4 (Four) responsive bidders are attached as Annexure-I.

12. At evaluation stage the Committee observed that;

i. As per Appendix-XI of RFP, bidder should submit the annual turnover excluding component of indirect taxes such as Service Tax, VAT, Sales Tax and GST etc. However, Appendix-XI of M/s Mehta Construction Co showing the turnover including indirect taxes. After considering the impact, the bidder remains eligible.

ii. In Appendix-XI of RFP, the amount mentioned at Sr. No. of 4 and 5 in the certificate issued by Statutory Auditor for turnover of M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd. lead member of M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV) are not same.

13. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) has recommended opening of the financial bid of the above 4 (Four) technically responsive bidders subject to the approval of the Competent Authority w.r.t Clause 2.1.15 of the RFP before opening of the Financial Bid. In case M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.-M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (JV) become L1 bidder clarification may obtained be from the Statutory Auditor of the bidder.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

W. Blah, (ED-V) Convener	K C Bhatt, DGM(T) Member Secretary	A.K. Jha, GM (T) Member	Mahesh Gupta, DGM (Fin)

Sr. No.		1		2	3	4	
Name of the bidder		M/s P.D. Agrawal Infrastructure Ltd. (lead member)	M/s Apex Structure Pvt. Ltd. (JV) (other member)	M/s Mehta Construction Co.	M/s JKM Infra Works LLP	M/s Vijeta Projects & Infrastructure Ltd.	M/s Sweety Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.
		51%	49%	100%	100%	51%	49%
Sole/JV		JV		Sole	Sole	JV	
Country		India		India	India	India	
Minimum threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i) Sole = 86.46 Cr. LM=51.87 Cr. OM=17.29 Cr.		449.12 Cr.	40.03 Cr.	257.08 Cr.	237.04 Cr.	427.05 Cr.	63.80 Cr.
		489.15 Cr.				490.85 Cr.	
Minimum threshold technical capability from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause-2.2.2.2-(ii) Rs. 25.94 Cr.		112.80 Cr. "1a" of lead member		50.62 Cr. "a"	50.96 Cr. "G"	44.40 Cr. from other member	
Minimum Net Worth (Rs. in Cr.) (Sole=8.65 Cr., LM=5.19 Cr, OM=1.73 Cr.)		154.63 Cr.	12.70 Cr.	32.21 Cr.	38.11 Cr.	112.39 Cr.	31.22 Cr.
		167.33 Cr.				143.61 Cr.	
Average Annual Turnover (Rs. in Cr.) (Sole=25.94 Cr., LM=15.56 Cr., OM=5.19 Cr.)		153.99 Cr.	41.95 Cr.	89.63 Cr.	153.61 Cr.	210.67 Cr.	20.15 Cr.
		195.94 Cr.				230.82 Cr.	
Whether meeting the Bid Capacity (Rs. in Cr.) (Sole = 86.46 Cr. LM=51.87 Cr. OM=17.29 Cr.)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Projects held with NHIDCL	Nos.	-	-	-	1	-	-
	Cost (Crores)	-	-	-	148.00 Cr.	-	-
Whether meeting the Technical Requirement		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Responsiveness		Responsive		Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	