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





(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/Civil Work/A.P/ Taksing to Ghora/2020 /2245

Date- 24.12.2020

To,

All Respective Bidders,

Sub: "Construction of High Altitude Hill road from Taksing to Ghora from KM 0.000 to KM 7.090 in Upper Subansiri District of the state of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode".

Reference Tender ID: 2020_NHIDC_593703_1 Sir,

Please refer to your bid submitted for the subject cited above. The following is the result of technical evaluation. The minutes of technical evaluation dated 23.12.2020 is

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	Technically Responsive
2	M/s Globes Infracon Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
3	M/s Nima Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive
4	M/s Shivsai Construction	Technically Responsive
5	M/s LNS Infrastructure	,
5	M/s Vertex Construction	Technically Responsive Technically Responsive

Financial bid of technical responsive bidders shall be opened on 28.12.2020 at 1100 hrs in NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd floor, PTI Building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001.

Yours Sincerely,

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for: "Construction of High Altitude Hill road from Taksing to Ghora from KM 0.000 to KM 7.090 in Upper Subansiri District of the state of Arunachal Pradesh on EPC Mode" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at on 23.12.2020.

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 08.12.2020 at 1100 hrs.

- 2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.
 - (i) M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency
 - (ii) M/s Globes Infracon Pvt. Ltd.
 - (iii) M/s Nima Enterprises
 - (iv) M/s LNS Infrastructure
 - (v) M/s Shivsai Construction JV M/s Rinya Yangfo Construction
 - (vi) M/s Vertex Construction
- 3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of Rs 70.63 Crore.

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount Cr.	in	Rs.
1	Estimated Project Cost	70.63		
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	35.32	ı	
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)	21.19		
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)	7.06		
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)			
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))			
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 Project eligible as defii clause 2. (d).	Cost proj ned	of ects in
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))	3.53		
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	3.53		
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.12		
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	0.71		
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	10.59		
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	6.36		

Aj ceyn

Ah

Page 1 of 10

14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	2.12
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	35.315
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	21.189
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	7.063

- 4. The Evaluation Committee during evaluation found that some of the data/information provided by the Bidders are not adhering to the clauses given in the RFP document, so it was proposed that the clarification may be sought from the Bidders as per clause no 3.1.4 of the RFP to facilitate the evaluation process. Accordingly, the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) in its first meeting had decided that the clarification as requested by the Technical Division is to be sought from the respective bidders.
- **5.** In Continuation to 1st Meeting of **Technical Evaluation Committee** (**TEC**) held on 16.12.2020, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 21.12.2020. 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		cation to be sought	Reply received by the bidder	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	, ,	UDIN numbers for all submitted eligible projects are not located. Please clarify	(i) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflect year wise breakup of receivable value of the civil work	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in
		(ii) on Ap	UDIN number are not located pendix x, xi. Please Clarify	(ii) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number for appendix x, xi	order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee
		(iii)	The balance sheet for FY 2019-20 could not be located. If not audited then undertaking needs to be submitted as per RFP section 2 clause 2.2.2.8 (ii). Please clarify	(iii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking for FY 2019- 20 for non submission of Audited Balance Sheet.	decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
		(iv)	Appendix 1-A Annexure II, Project wise category, Project code and Payment received from the construction of eligible projects are not located. Please clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted Appendix 1-A Annexure II as per RFP format.	
		(v)	For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be	(v) The bidder has submitted the client certificate for consideration of single work under category 1 &	

m shi

Page 2 of 10

AjayA

located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (vi) Name of the banker as stated in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify (vii) Year wise receivable value of (vii) The bidder has submitted detail of banker.	
(vi) Name of the banker as stated in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
not be located. Please Clarify submitted detail of banker. (vii) Year wise receivable value of	
(vii) Year wise receivable value of	
(vii) Year wise receivable value of	
following projects could not (vii) The bidder has	
following projects could not (vii) The bidder has be located. Please clarify. submitted the receivable	
a. Construction of CC value of the required	
Pavement Road in projects.	
Itanagar (under	
Naharlagun Division).	
b. Construction of cement	
concrete Road, Nirjuli	
Township and Entire	
Model Village,	
Naharlagun (7KM)	
under CRF Scheme in	
the state of Arunachal	
Pradesh.	
c. Double Laning of steel	
Arch Borum Bridge at	
Naharlagun (90.00 mtr	
Span) 2 M/s Globes (i) UDIN numbers for all (i) The bidder has The reply	.,
2 M/s Globes (i) UDIN numbers for all (i) The bidder has The reply submitted eligible projects are submitted the UDIN submitted	
Ltd. submitted engine projects are submitted the oblive submitted bidder have been submitted bidder bidde	
year wise breakup of scrutiniz	
receivable value of the the comm	
civil work. Since the	
is technic	
(ii) Year wise receivable value of (ii) Bidder has and finar	
all submitted projects could submitted Year wise eligible.	Hence
not be located. Please clarify. receivable value of all the comm	
submitted projects. decided	
consider	
(iii) The bidder has as Techn	
(iii) UDIN number are not located submitted UDIN number responsive	/e
on Appendix x, xi. Please for Appendix X,XI.	
Clarify.	
(iv) For consideration of single (iv) The bidder has	
(iv) For consideration of single (iv) The bidder has	
work under category 1 & 3, submitted the client	
work under category 1 & 3, submitted the client experience certificate from certificate for	
work under category 1 & 3, submitted the client experience certificate from certificate for the authority could not be consideration of	
work under category 1 & 3, submitted the client experience certificate from the authority could not be consideration of located .Please identify the single work under	
work under category 1 & 3, submitted the client experience certificate from certificate for the authority could not be consideration of	

A going

The

im Ship

		FY 2017-2018 could not be located. Please clarify. (vi) Reference number from bank for submission of cost of Bid does not match with our records. Please clarify	(v) The bidder has submitted the Profit and loss statement for FY 2017-2018. (vi) The bidder has submitted the Bank Reference number for cost of Bid	
3	M/s Nima Enterprises	(i) As per RFP section 7 (4) Threshold Technical Capacity should be 35.32 Cr. as per submitted Appendix 1-A Annexure II and Appendix 1-A Annexure IV Threshold technical capacity is 26.25 Cr. which is less than the required. Please clarify (ii) Appendix x, xi could not be located. Please Clarify (iii) Project code "A" statutory certificate and year wise receivable value could not be located. Please clarify (iv) 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.	It was observed that during evaluation the bidder had claimed Threshold Technical Capacity 26.25 Cr. which is less than the required as per RFP i.e. 35.32 Cr. in view of that the clarification was mailed to the bidder on 16.12.2020 and had to submit the clarification by 19.12.2020 till 1700 Hrs. and bidder have not submitted any clarification till date of meeting.	The Committee has scrutinized the submitted bid and observed that the claimed Threshold Technical Capacity of the firm is 26.25 Cr. As per RFP section 7 (4)) Threshold Technical Capacity should be 35.32 Cr. Further, the bidder has not submitted the clarification in this regards. Hence the committee considered the Threshold Technical Capacity submitted in the bid which is 26.25 Cr and does not meet the minimum Threshold Technical Capacity of 35.32 Cr the committee consider the bid as Technical Capacity of 35.32 Cr the committee consider the bid as Technically non responsive

Agony

A My

4	M/s Shivsai Construction JV M/s Rinya Yangfo Construction	experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Appendix x, xi could not be located. Please Clarify (ii) x, x	omitted the client rtificate for nsideration of single ork under category 1 & The bidder has bmitted the Appendix xi.	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
			dited Balance sheet e submitted by bidders.	responsive
		(iv) Name of the banker as stated in Para 6 on Annexure III could not be located. Please Clarify.	bmitted the detail of nker.	
		(v) Power of Attorney could not be located. Please clarify	bmitted the POA.	
			M/s Rinya Yangfo Construction	
		work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	bmitted the client rtificate for nsideration of single ork under category 1 &	
		2016-17 could not be located. Ba) The Bidder has bmitted the Audited lance sheet for FY 116-17.	
		(iii)Power of Attorney could not be located. Please clarify sul	i) The bidder has bmitted POA.	
5	M/s Vertex 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.	(vii) The bidder has submitted the client 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

Ar Com

Page 5 of 10

the committee
decided to
consider the bid
as Technically
responsive.

- 6. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the above bidders are as Annexure -I.
- 7. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) in its 2nd meeting has discussed the evaluation and after deliberation status of evaluation is as below.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s North East Engineering & Construction Agency	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Globes Infracon Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s Nima Enterprises	Technically Non Responsive	0
4	M/s Shivsai Construction JV Rinya Yangfo Construction	Technically Responsive	0
5	M/s LNS Infrastructure	Technically Responsive	1- Arunachal Pradesh
6	M/s Vertex Construction	Technically Responsive	0

9. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 5 technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahulwalia

(ED-I) Chairman

B. Shivprasad

(GM-Tech)

Member

A.K. Jha (GM-Tech

Member

Bhaskar Mallick

Manager -Fin.

Member