

# 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



CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062

(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

(A Government of India Enterprise)

**NHIDCL/AP/Hayuliang-Hawai/P4-Balance work/2021/2405**

**Date: 27.03.2021**

To

All Respective Bidders,

Subject: Construction of Balance work of Two - Lane with hard shoulders of Existing Hayuliang - Hawai Road (NH-113) from design km 51.825 to km 63.131 (Existing km 45.050 of Hayuliang - Hawai Road to Hawai town)(11.306 km) on EPC basis in the state of Arunachal Pradesh Package of SARDP -NE (Green Field Alignment)- **Financial Bid Opening-Reg.**

Sir,


Refer Tender ID: **2020\_NHIDC\_618055\_1**

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. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s Shrusthi Contech Private Limited	Technically Non Responsive
2	M/s Sonia Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates	Technically Responsive
4	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non Responsive as per clause 2.1.15

2. Financial bid of technical responsive bidders shall be opened on 30/03/2021 at 1500 hrs in NHIDCL, HQ, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, PTI building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

Encl.- As above.

  
(A.K. Jha) 27/03  
General Manager (Tech.)

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2<sup>nd</sup> Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for: "Construction of Balance work of Two - Lane with hard shoulders of Existing Hayuliang - Hawaii Road (NH-113) from design km 51.825 to km 63.131 (Existing km 45.050 of Hayuliang - Hawaii Road to Hawaii town)(11.306 km) on EPC basis in the state of Arunachal Pradesh Package of SARDP -NE (Green Field Alignment)" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at on 26.03.2021.

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 16.03.2021.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

- (i) M/s Satya Builders
- (ii) M/s Shruthi Contech Private Limited
- (iii) M/s Sonia Enterprises
- (iv) M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of Rs 135 Crore.

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	135.00
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	67.50
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)	40.50
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)	13.50
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)	20.25
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) )	6.75
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) )	6.75
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	6.75
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	4.05
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.35
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	20.25
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	12.15
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause	4.05





	2.2.2.4 (i)	
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	67.5
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	40.50
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	13.50

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 brought to the notice of the committee that M/s Satya Builders has been awarded 2 projects both in Manipur state as per clause 2.1.15 of RFP *"The bidder including individual or any of its JV member, who are either having 2 (two) on-going EPC Project(s) in NHIDCL or on-going Project(s) worth of ₹ 500 Crore (Awarded Cost) or more in NHIDCL, as on date of financial bid opening, shall not be eligible to bid for this Project (Issuance of LOA will be considered as on-going project)"*. It was also noticed that the M/s Satya Builders have not submitted the cost of bid.

6. In Continuation to 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** held on 23.03.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 26.03.2021. 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 by the bidder	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s Shrusthi Contech Private Limited	(i) As per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) (b) <i>"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"</i> . 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	(i) The bidder replied by mail dated 25-03-2021 "We don't have the qualification requirement of required span length i.e 85 meters of span"	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. Since the bidder vide mail clarifies that the firm has no experience in construction of bridge span length more than 85 meters. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive.

Ajay A

MPL

for

		<p>largest span may be submitted. Please Clarify.</p> <p>(ii) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify.</p>		
2	M/s Sonia Enterprises	<p>(i) As per Appendix-XI of RFP, bidders should provide Annual Turnover of last five financial years excluding taxes liable on Sales/Service. However, tax amount has not been shown in Appendix-XI. Hence, the bidder is required to clarify whether the Annual Turnover is excluding Tax or not.</p> <p>(ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 &amp; 3, experience certificate from the Authority could not be located. Please identify the page number and clarify.</p> <p>(iii) As per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) (b) <i>"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"</i>. 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.</p>	<p>i) The bidder clarifies that the Appendix-XI excludes the tax amount in the turnover.</p> <p>ii) The bidder has submitted authority certificate for the consideration of single work.</p> <p>iii) The bidder has submitted authority certificate which specifies the span length of the bridge.</p>	<p>It was bought to the notice of the committee that a complaint was received regarding the genuineness of the experience certificate submitted by the bidder for the project <b>"Construction of RCC Bridge Over River Kurung (2X 90.00 Mtr Span) at Rayung to connect Rungte via Deby, Tudbath, Patey Phalap in Arunachal Pradesh."</b> and as per approval by the competent Authority, the certificate submitted by the bidder has been got verified through ED (P) Itanagar and GM(P) Ziro. ED(P) Vide letter dated 26<sup>th</sup> March 2021 has submitted the verification letter from Executive Engineer, Sangram Division, PWD, Wherein the issuing authority has stated that</p> <p>"It is to reiterate that no such completion certificate has been issued through the office of the EE, Sangram Division, PWD."</p> <p>Since the bidder has submitted false experience certificate, hence as per RFP section 2 clause 2.6.3, the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive and recommend to take action on the bidder as per RFP clause 2.6.3.</p>

Ajay

Mpl

Sh



		<p>Please Clarify.</p> <p>(iv) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify.</p> <p>(v) Proper values of the respective years to be shown in UDIN on ICAI portal. Please clarify.</p>	<p>(iv) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm.</p> <p>(v) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflect year wise turnover in UDIN on ICAI portal.</p>	
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates	<p><b>A. M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.</b></p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(ii) Project code B to J submitted for eligible projects for Appendix- IA Annexure IV UDIN could not be located. Please clarify.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(iv) Appendix X (Certificate of Net worth by Statutory Auditor) it has been observed that "NA" has been mentioned in the all rows of the format. Please clarify.</p> <p>(v) UDIN on ICAI Portal does</p>	<p><b>A. M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.</b></p> <p>(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise breakup of receivable values in UDIN on ICAI portal.</p> <p>(ii) Bidder has submitted UDIN number for eligible projects.</p> <p>(iii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm.</p> <p>(iv) The bidder has submitted Appendix X as per RFP format.</p> <p>(v) The bidder has</p>	<p>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</p>

Ajay A

M

bn

		<p>not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify</p> <p>(vi) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the Net worth. Please clarify.</p> <p>(vii) As per Appendix-XI of RFP, bidders should provide Annual Turnover of last five financial years excluding taxes liable on Sales/Service. However, tax amount has not been shown in Appendix-XI. Hence, the bidder is required to clarify whether the Annual Turnover is excluding Tax or not.</p> <p><b>B. M/s GRRB Associates</b></p> <p>(i) Appendix- IA Annexure IV UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise breakup of receivable values. Please clarify.</p> <p>(ii) As per RFP clause 2.1.14 (xv), Undertaking to be submitted regarding Negative list of the firm could not be located. Please clarify.</p> <p>(iii) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify</p> <p>(iv) As per Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 the turnover is Rs 24.37 Cr but as per Appendix XI the turnover is 42.17 Cr and same has been mentioned in UDIN on ICAI portal. Please</p>	<p>submitted the UDIN number which reflects year wise turnover in UDIN on ICAI portal.</p> <p>(vi) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflects Net worth of the firm.</p> <p>(vii) The bidder clarifies that the Appendix-XI excludes the tax amount in the turnover.</p> <p><b>B.M/s GRRB Associates</b></p> <p>(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise breakup of receivable values in UDIN on ICAI portal.</p> <p>ii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding Negative list of the firm.</p> <p>iii) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflects year wise turnover in UDIN on ICAI portal.</p> <p>iv) The bidder clarifies that "There are two Profit &amp; Loss Account uploaded for the Financial Year 2019-20, First one from 01-04-2019 to 31 10-2019 and the Second from 01-</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Ajay A

MH

gh ad

		clarify.	<p>11-2019 to 31-03-2020. Annual Turnover for the year is 2457.96 Lakhs (from 01-04 2019 to 31-10-2019) plus 1759.31 Lakhs i.e. 4217.27 Lakhs which tallies with the turnover of Rs. 4217.27 Lakhs given in the Appendix XI of the Turnover Certificate. We may submit that from 1 Nov 2019 our Firms Legal Constitution has been changed from Proprietorship to Partnership firm. That Combined Annual Turnover of M/S. GRRB ASSOCIATES (Proprietorship and M/S. GRRB ASSOCIATES (Partnership) are taken together. We had also uploaded financial statements for the financial year 2019-20 of both M/S. GRRB ASSOCIATES (Proprietorship) and M/S. GRRB ASSOCIATES (Partnership) under the heading of "INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT, BALANCE SHEET AND PROFIT &amp; LOSS ACCOUNT SCHEDULES."</p>	
		<p>(v) As per Appendix-XI of RFP, bidders should provide Annual Turnover of last five financial years excluding taxes liable on Sales/Service. However, tax amount has not been shown in Appendix-XI. Hence, the bidder is required to clarify whether the Annual Turnover is excluding Tax or not.</p>	<p>vi) The bidder clarifies that the Appendix-XI excludes the tax amount in the turnover.</p>	

Ajay

M

for



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

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s Shrusthi Contech Private Limited	Technically Non Responsive	0
2	M/s Sonia Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive	0
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates	Technically Responsive	0
4	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non Responsive as per clause 2.1.15	2 (Manipur)

9. It was brought to the notice of the committee that this is the third time that the bids have been invited for the subject project. First time, three bids were received, where no bidder was found eligible due to lack of bridge experience. Second time no bids were received. It was also brought to the notice of the committee that this bid is for award for the balance work of the original work, which was foreclosed. Hence, to utilise the working period and for maintenance of the stretch during monsoon mobilisation of new contractor is necessarily required.


The committee taking note of the above and recommends to open the financial bid of the single bidder being the third call to see the reasonability of the bid. The financial bid may be opened after the approval of the competitive authority.

10. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 1 (One) technically responsive bidder after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.



Ajay Ahutwalia  
(ED-I)  
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. 67.50 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause- 2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 20.25 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 40.50 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 13.50 Cr.	Span Length of the Bridge (50% of the longest span) i.e. 85 meters
1	M/s Shrusthi Contech Private Limited	324.20 Cr	Yes (Rs 45.54 Cr)	NA	NA	No bridge experience
2	M/s Sonia Enterprises	81.81 Cr	Yes ( Rs 45.73 Cr)	NA	NA	No bridge experience
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates	NA	Yes ( Rs 33.90 Cr)	144.25 Cr	14.36 Cr	162 meter
4	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non Responsive as per clause 2.1.15				

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 14.85 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 44.55 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1.	M/s Shrusthi Contech Private Limited	SE	-	34.72 Cr	132.93 Cr	Y
2.	M/s Sonia Enterprises	SE	-	21.66 Cr	54.63 Cr	Y
3.	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates	JV	51-49	Lead - 10.67 Cr Other- 5.85 Cr	Lead- 30.03 Cr Other - 25.73 Cr	Y
4.	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non Responsive as per clause 2.1.15				



### Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment

Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 67.50 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 Shruthi Contech Private Limited	2019	1	140.27	140.27	2	75.11	626.24	Yes
2	M/s Sonia Enterprises	2019	1	59.86	59.86	2	1.7	297.60	Yes
3	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s GRRB Associates								
	M/s Poddar Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2019	1	56.18	56.18	2	76.32	204.58	Yes
	M/s GRRB Associates	2019	1	42.17	42.17	2	38.54	172.31	Yes
							Total	376.89	Yes
4.	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non Responsive as per clause 2.1.15							