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/Nagaland/MTM/Pkg5/ 2021/ 942 09.07.2021

To

All the Technically Qualified Bidders

Sub: Construction of Two-Lane with hard shoulders of Merangkong Tamlu Mon road (Wakching Town portion) on EPC basis from existing Km 59+000 to Km 73+640 [Design Km. 59+000 to Km. 72+450] (Design Length - 13.450 Km)(Package V) in the state of Nagaland under SARDP NH(O)-NE on EPC Mode - **Opening of Financial Bid- reg.**

Based on the 2nd Minutes of meeting of TEC, 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 C. Gopal Reddy and Company	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	Technically Responsive	0
4	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	Nagaland=1 (OIA) Andaman & Nicobar=1 (Kaba)
5	M/s A G Construction	Technically Responsive	Sikkim=1
6	M/s Durga Construction Company	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 12.07.2021 at 1500 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

1530441/2021/Technical

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (TEC) for **Construction of Two-Lane with hard shoulders of Merangkong Tamlu Mon road (Wakching Town portion) on EPC basis from existing Km 59+000 to Km 73+640 [Design Km. 59+000 to Km. 72+450] (Design Length - 13.450 Km)(Package V) in the state of Nagaland under SARDP NH(O)-NE on EPC Mode"** held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at **on 07.07-2021.**

The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 01.07.2021 at 1100 hrs.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

(i) M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited
(ii) M/s C Gopal Reddy and Co
(iii) M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company
(iv) M/s Durga Construction Company
(v) M/s A G Construction
(vi) M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 110.92 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	110.92
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	55.46
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)	33.276
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)	11.092
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)	16.638
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))	5.546
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))	5.546
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	5.546
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	3.3276
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.1092

12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	16.638
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	9.9828
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	3.3276
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	55.46
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	33.276
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	11.092

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 05.07.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 07.07.2021.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 C. Gopal Reddy and Company	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for annexure IV for all eligible projects. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflect turnover of last 5 years.	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) 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 the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3.	
		(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). If audited balance sheet of FY 2019-20	(iii) The bidder has submitted the undertaking regarding non submission of Audited Balance sheet for FY2019-20.	

		is going to be submitted, Accordingly Appendix X, Appendix XI needs to be submitted as per RFP format. Please clarify. (iv) Reference number from Bank submitted for the proof of submission of cost of bid could not be located. Please clarify. (v) Annexure 1 Details of bidder could not be located. Please clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted reference number from Bank submitted for the proof of submission of cost of bid. (v) The bidder has submitted Annexure I as per RFP format.	
2	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	(i) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify (ii) Units are not mention in UDIN on ICAI Portal for uploaded for Appendix X. Please clarify. (iii) Reference number from Bank submitted for the proof of submission of cost of bid could not be located. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number which reflects year wise Turnover values. (ii) Bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects units for Appendix X. (iii) The bidder has submitted reference number from Bank submitted for the proof of submission of 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.
3	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	(i) Appendix X, XI could not be located. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X,XI as per RFP format. ii) The bidder has submitted Authority Certificate for calculation of value of B.	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.

4	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	**A. M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (INDIA) Private Limited** (i) 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. (ii) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not depict year wise breakup of receivable value for all submitted eligible projects. Please clarify. (iii) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. 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 **B. M/s Kaba Infratech Private Limited** (i) UDIN number for Appendix x is incorrect. Please clarify. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, , experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please	**A. M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (INDIA) Private Limited** (i) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20. (ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise breakup of receivable value for all submitted eligible projects. (iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depicts Turn over value. (iv) The bidder has submitted the experience certificate of single work under category 1 & 3. **B. M/s Kaba Infratech Private Limited** (i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for appendix X. (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.

		identify the page number and clarify		
5	M/s A G Construction	(i) UDIN on ICAI Portal does not show the turnover of last 5 years. Please clarify. (ii) Mismatch in the values of the Eligible project submitted in UDIN on ICAI Portal. Please clarify (iii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for annexure IV for all eligible projects. Please clarify. (iv) Units are not mentioned in UDIN on ICAI Portal for uploaded for Appendix X. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for Turnover. (ii) The bidder clarifies that "It is typographic mistake. We are submitting the correct value of the Eligible project code "a" for your reference". (iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for annexure IV. (iv) The bidder has submitted the UDIN number for appendix X.	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 Durga Construction Company	No clarification sought	----------	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 C. Gopal Reddy and Company	Technically Responsive	0
2	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	Technically Responsive	0
4	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	Nagaland=1 (OIA) Andaman & Nicobar=1 (Kaba)
5	M/s A G Construction	Technically Responsive	Sikkim=1
6	M/s Durga Construction Company	Technically Responsive	0

9. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 6 (Six) technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Anulwalia
(ED)
Chairman

B. Shivprasad
(GM-Tech)
Member

A.K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member

Bhaskar Mallick
Manager -Finance
Member

Annexure - I

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs. 55.46 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause-2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 16.64 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 33.28 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 11.09 Cr.
1	M/s C. Gopal Reddy and Company	97.48 Cr	Yes (Rs 53.68 Cr)	NA	NA
2	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	112.67 Cr	Yes (Rs 45.09 Cr)	NA	NA
3	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	85.73 Cr	Yes (Rs 69.22 Cr)	NA	NA
4	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	NA	Yes (Rs 28.67 Cr)	329.14 Cr	48.58 Cr
5	M/s A G Construction	494.86 Cr	Yes (Rs 130.48 Cr)	NA	NA
6	M/s Durga Construction Company	94.26 Cr	Yes (Rs 25.15 Cr)	NA	NA

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 5.55 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 16.64 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1.	M/s C. Gopal Reddy and Company	SE	-	29.19 Cr	60.66 Cr	Y
2.	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	SE	-	11.59 Cr	99.69 Cr	Y
3.	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	SE	-	6.74 Cr	23.51 Cr	Y
4.	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	JV	70%-30%	Lead-149.76 Cr Other- 4.87 Cr	Lead-117.28 Cr Other- 14.44 Cr	Y
5.	M/s A G Construction	SE	-	69.84 Cr	141.39 Cr	Y
6	M/s Durga Construction Company	SE	-	12.59 Cr	33.44 Cr	Y

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment									
Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 55.46 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 C. Gopal Reddy and Company	2018-19	1.05	130.88	137.42	1.5	0	**515.34**	Yes
2	M/s Ratna Infrastructure Projects Private Limited	2017-18	1.10	108.94	119.83	1.5	47.99	**401.39**	Yes
3	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Company	2017-18	1.10	23.46	25.81	1.5	5.99	**90.78**	Yes
4	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.								
	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd	2015-16	1.20	174.66	209.59	1.5	225.05	**560.92**	Yes

	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2019-20	1	27.47	27.47	1.5	74.11	**28.90**	Yes
							Total	**589.82**	Yes
5	M/s A G Construction	2018-19	1.05	245.53	257.81	1.5	210.16	**756.61**	Yes
6	M/s Durga Construction Company	2018-19	1.05	58.21	61.12	1.5	**24.56**	**204.64**	Yes