

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/AddlWork/Bareti/Uttarkashi/NH-34/2020/248

24.07.2020

To,

All the Technically Responsive Bidders (listed below)

Sub: Additional work for Construction of landslide protection gallery, slope protection works including cattle fence, restoration of irrigation channel and river protection work at Bareti, Uttarkashi from Km 100.300 TO Km 101.060 of NH-34 on EPC basis in the State of Uttarakhand-reg.

Ref: NIT & RFP document uploaded on CPP Portal.

Tender id: 2020_NHIDC_557646_1

Based on the Technical Evaluation, following 04 (Four) no. of bidders are found technically responsive for the subject project tender:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
3	M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
4	M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
5	M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Non-Responsive
6	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non-Responsive

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

3. Authority shall open the financial bids of all the Technically Responsive Bidders on 28.07.2020 at 15.00 hrs at NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4- Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001 in the presence of the Authorized Representatives of the Bidders who may choose to attend.

Encls. As stated above.

(Vivekanand Jaiswal)
Dy. General Manager (T)

National Highways and Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical Division)

Evaluation of Technical Bids for "Additional work for Construction of landslide protection gallery, slope protection works including cattle fence, restoration of irrigation channel and river protection work at Bareti, Uttarkashi from Km 100.300 TO Km 101.060 of NH-34 on EPC basis in the State of Uttarakhand."- 2nd ETEC Meeting held on 20.07.2020 at NHIDCL, HQ.

Bids were opened on 07.07.2020 and during the 1st ETEC meeting held on 10.07.2020, ETEC decided to seek clarifications from all the 06 (Six) bidders mentioned in the table below:

Sr.No.	Name of bidder
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd.
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.
3	M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.
4	M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.
5	M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd.
6	M/s Satya Builders

2. Accordingly, letters seeking clarifications were sent to all the 06 (Six) bidders vide NHIDCL letters dated 13.07.2020. In response, all 06 (Six) bidders submitted their clarifications within stipulated time and queries wise replies of the bidders are detailed below:

M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendation of ETEC
1	Clause 2.2.2.7	The bidder has provided details of 17 projects from Project Code 'A' to 'Q', in term of Annex II read with Annex IV of RFP. signed copy of client has not been submitted for the projects having project code 'G', 'I', 'L' and 'M'. Please clarify.	Signed copy of Client has not submitted for projects having project code 'G', 'I', 'L' and 'M' because Client has appointed consultancy services (Authority Engineer) for the supervision of the works till the completion of the work and the Authorized person/Authority Engineer of the concerned consultancy firm can issue	The bidder has not furnished the signed copy of clients for the projects having project code 'G', 'I', 'L' and 'M'. However, the bidder has satisfied the minimum technical threshold requirement by excluding these projects mentioned above.	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.



			completion certificates on behalf of its client as its representative, so we have submitted completion certificates issued by them and the Authorized person/Authority Engineer can only issue the completion certificate when the client is properly satisfied and agrees the same. However, we have submitted some certificates of some other works for which we are qualifying the criteria.	Outcome : May be considered	
2	Clause 2.2.2.5	There is discrepancy in the Name of Work for Project 'H' as stated in Annex-IV with respect to that provided in enclosed supporting document of the client. Please clarify.	There is discrepancy in the name of Work for Project 'H' as stated in Annex IV with respect to the completion certificate provided by us because in Annex IV we have written the name of work as per LOA issued to us and the Completion Certificate, Authority has mentioned the details as per the Contract bond. But, kindly notice that Package No. is the same and submitted both documents are pertaining to same contract.	The bidder has provided requisite supporting document from the Client. Outcome : May be considered	
3	Clause 2.2.2.5	The payment received for the execution and completion of Project 'N' is shown more than the estimated project cost by including Bonus & price-adjustment received during the course of Project. Please clarify.	Estimated cost (awarded value) is pertaining to Project code 'N'. Apart from estimated cost, we have made price adjustment and bonus payment as per Contract provision. That is why payment received is reflecting more than the estimated cost and is also mentioned in work certificate.	The bidder has provided requisite document from the client which states that the payment received is reflecting more than estimated cost due to bonus and price adjustment. Outcome : May be	







- 3 -

				considered	
4	Clause 2.2.2.2	Please clarify the updation factor used in calculation of Bid Capacity, Net Worth, Average annual Turnover and Technical experience with respect to the RFP.	Due to non-filling of TDS returns of some of our works by the Govt. Dept. which was to be done by 30.06.2020 but the Govt. has extended the date of filling TDS returns upto 31.07.2020 due to COVID-19 pandemic so the finalization of Balance sheets for the year 2019-20 may take some more time therefore we have submitted the date of last 5 financial years i.e 2014-15 to 2018-19 and accordingly updation factor has been applied. Bid capacity is also calculated as per the turn-over of 2018-19. We have also uploaded provisional balance sheets of the financial year 2019-20 along with the undertaking of the CA for the latest financial years.	The updation factor used by bidder and duly certified by the Statutory Auditor does not lie in accordance to Clause 2.2.2.2 and as per Annex III of Appendix IA. However, the financial capacity and bid capacity satisfy the minimum requirement for eligibility of the bidder. Outcome : May be considered	

M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendations of ETEC
1	Clause 2.2.2.7	The bidder has provided details of 6 projects from Project Code 'a' to 'f', in term of Annex II read with Annex IV of RFP. Supporting document from Client is not provided for Project 'c'. Please clarify.	The requested was submitted to NHAI for insurance but the same was delayed. Now, the copy of ongoing work certificate issued and enclosed herewith for reply reference.	The bidder has furnished the certification from its client for the Project code 'c'. Outcome : May be considered	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.
2	Clause 2.2.2.2,	Please clarify the updation factor used in calculation of Bid Capacity, Net Worth,	Annual account of F.Y. 2019-20 is under finalization stage and date of the same has	The updation factor used by bidder and duly certified by the Statutory Auditor	

		Average annual Turnover and Technical experience.	also been extended till 30th Nov 2020 due to which we have considered the next preceding year as year 1 and other years.	does not lie in accordance to Clause 2.2.2.2 and as per Annex III of Appendix IA. However, the financial capacity and bid capacity satisfy the minimum requirement for eligibility of the bidder. Outcome : May be considered	
3	Clause 2.2.2.8(ii)	Undertaking of the Statutory Auditor is not available. Please clarify.	Date of finalization of annual returns have been extended till 30th Nov 2020 (Notification enclosed). However, the undertaking of statutory auditor is also enclosed.	Bidder has furnished requisite document. Outcome : May be considered	

M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendations of ETEC
1	Appendix-III	Copy of Board Resolution vesting Power of Attorney to the Authorized Signatory is not available. Please clarify.	Copy of Board Resolution is enclosed.	Bidder has furnished requisite document. Outcome : May be considered	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.
2	Clause 2.2.2.2	Please clarify the updation factor used in calculation of Bid Capacity, Net Worth, Average annual Turnover and Technical experience.	As per undertaking 2.2.2.8 (ii) in which mentioned that we are not able to submit, the audited report for 2019-20 because report will be audited on 30.09.2020. Therefore, we are submitting audited report for last 5 years i.e 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17,	The updation factor used by bidder and duly certified by the Statutory Auditor does not lie in accordance to Clause 2.2.2.2 and as per Annex III of Appendix IA. However, the	

4/12

			<p>2017-18 and 2018-19.</p> <p>Updation factor which we are used taken as Year 1 (2018-19), Year 2 (2017-18), Year 3 (2016-17), Year 4 (2015-16), Year 5 (2014-15) and as per this Year 2 (2017-18) used for calculation of bid capacity and LOA of ongoing work was awarded to us in 2019 so that updation factor used for calculation of B is 1.</p> <p>Copy of available Bid Capacity, Net Worth, Average Annual Turnover and Technical Experience is enclosed.</p>	<p>financial capacity and bid capacity satisfy the minimum requirement for eligibility of the bidder.</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>	
3	Clause 2.2.2.8(ii)	Undertaking of the Statutory Auditor is not available. Please clarify.	Copy of undertaking is enclosed.	<p>Bidder has furnished requisite document.</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>	

M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendations of ETEC
1	Clause 2.2.2.7	The Bidder has provided details of 3 projects from Project Code 'a' to 'c', in term of Annex II read with Annex IV of RFP. Supporting Certificates from the Statutory Auditor have not been submitted for all these projects. Please clarify.	We are enclosing Supporting certificate from the Statutory Auditor for the eligible project under category '3' (clause 2.2.2.5, page no.22) herein marked as 'a' in Annex II read with Annex IV (marked as 1). However, we also mentioned project 'b' & 'c' under category '4' for showing our capabilities as	<p>The bidder has furnished requisite certificates from the Statutory Auditor.</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.



			additional.		
2	Clause 2.2.2.1	<p>5 (Five) numbers of ongoing projects are mentioned in Annex VI for calculation of value of 'B'. However, supporting documents provided by the bidder does not provide enough clarification of execution of these projects due to discrepancies in name and client of the projects. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Name and client of the 5 (Five) numbers of ongoing projects are as under:</p> <p>1. Name of work: Rohtang highway tunnel project, Rohtang Himachal Pradesh Work: Waterproofing Client: Stragbag Afcons JV</p> <p>2. Name of work: Ahmedabad Metro, Ahmedabad Gujrat Work: Waterproofing of Kalupur station Client: Afcons Infrastructure Limited</p> <p>3. Name of work: Construction project child Job Work: Waterproofing system in underground tunnel Client: L&T Constructions</p> <p>4. Name of work: Façade stabilization project American Centre, Kolkata Work:</p>	<p>Supporting documents from the client are not furnished. Thus, there is no clarity on the execution of these ongoing projects.</p> <p>However, the bidder has satisfied the minimum bid capacity requirement as per RFP.</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>	

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

			<p>Construction Services Client: American Consultant General, United states Govt.</p> <p>5. Name of work: Lulu Mall Project, Lucknow Work: Repairs and Rehabilitation Client: Katerra India Pvt. Ltd.</p>			
3	Clause 2.2.2.2	Please clarify the updation factor used in calculation of Bid Capacity, Net Worth, Average annual Turnover and Technical experience.	<p>We considered updation factor as under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2018-19 - 1 2. 2017-18 - 1.05 3. 2016-17 - 1.10 4. 2015-16 - 1.15 5. 2014-15 - 1.20 <p>Since we are not having audited balance sheet for the year 2019-20 for which we are submitting undertaking from statutory auditor as per point no. 4, therefore we have considered the updation factor as mentioned above for evaluation. However, if we consider updation factor as 1 for the year 2019-2020, even then we are sufficiently qualified as per clause 2.2.2.</p>	<p>The updation factor used by bidder and duly certified by the Statutory Auditor does not lie in accordance to Clause 2.2.2.2 and as per Annex III of Appendix IA.</p> <p>However, the financial capacity satisfies the minimum requirement for eligibility of the bidder.</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>		
4	Clause 2.2.2.8(ii)	Undertaking of the Statutory Auditor is not available. Please clarify.	Enclosing	<p>Bidder has furnished requisite undertaking from the Statutory Auditor</p> <p>Outcome : May be considered</p>		

7/12 JN (3M21)

5	Clause 2.2.2.6	The bidder has claimed projects under category 1& 3. Please clarify the same and list out the projects individually category wise.	Eligible project marked as 'a' in Annexure-IV is under category-3 and also mentioned as 1 in "Certificate regarding construction works"	The eligible projects claimed by the bidder fall under category-3. Outcome : May be considered	
---	----------------	--	---	--	--

M/s Satya Builders

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendations of ETEC
1	Clause 2.2.2.7	The bidder has provided details of 01 (one) projects with Project Code 'a', in term of Annex II read with Annex IV of RFP. The yearly price breakup of payment received by the bidder during its contract period has not been provided duly certified by statutory auditor. Please clarify.	Detail breakup which is rectified and duly signed by Statutory Auditor is enclosed	The bidder has provided necessary information duly certified by the Statutory Auditor. Outcome : May be considered	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.
2	Clause 2.2.2.8(ii)	Undertaking of the Statutory Auditor is not available. Please clarify.	An undertaking from the Statutory Auditor for the latest financial year has been enclosed.	Bidder has furnished requisite undertaking from the Statutory Auditor Outcome : May be considered	
3	Clause 2.2.2.9	Signed copy of Financial statement (consisting details of Share Capital, Profit reserves etc) is not furnished from the Statutory Auditors for calculation of Net Worth. Please clarify. The year-wise bifurcation of cash	According to partnership act of 1932 of Indian Company Law there is no provision of share capital and profit reserved etc. partnership firm. For your kind perusal we have enclosed our partnership deed for your reference. Calculation with	Bidder has furnished the requisite documents. The clarification provided by the bidder for calculation of net worth is not justified. However, on the	

- 2 -

		accruals provided by the bidder needs to be clarified with respect to Annex III.	respect to Annex-III has been enclosed.	basis of yearly cash accruals certified by the Statutory Auditor, the bidder satisfies the minimum eligibility criteria of the financial capacity. Outcome : May be considered	
4	Clause 2.2.2.1	01 (One) number of Ongoing project is mentioned in Annex VI for calculation of value of 'B'. The same should be provided along with relevant documentary evidence issued from the client. Please clarify.	DDA certificate of ongoing work is enclosed as relevant document as evidence issued from the client.	Supporting document from the Client has been provided. Outcome : May be considered	
5	Appendix-III	Copy of Board Resolution vesting Power of Attorney to the Authorized Signatory is not available. Please clarify	Partnership resolution vesting Power of Attorney is enclosed here.	The bidder has provided the requisite document as required in the RFP. Outcome : May be considered	
6	Clause 2.2.2.6	The bidder has claimed project 'a' listed in Annex IV under category 1. Please clarify.	Same has been rectified as Category '3' and certified by the Statutory Auditor.	The bidder has provided necessary rectifications. Outcome : May be considered	

M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Reference to RFP	Description of clarifications sought	Reply by bidder	Comment of the Technical Dept.	Recommendations of ETEC
1	Clause 2.11.1.(j)	The bidder has not provided the Undertaking to abide by the Bid document. Please clarify.	Undertaking is enclosed	Bidder has furnished requisite undertaking to abide by the Bid document. Outcome : May be considered	ETEC agreed with the recommendations of the Technical Division.

[Handwritten signature]



[Handwritten signature] 9/12 *[Handwritten mark]*


2	Clause 2.2.2.9	Please clarify the details furnished year wise for calculation of such Networth as per Annex III - Financial Capacity of the Bidder.	Annex-III Financial capacity of the Bidder is enclosed	The bidder has furnished year-wise calculation of Networth as per Annex III - Financial Capacity of the Bidder. Outcome : May be considered	
---	-------------------	--	--	---	--

3. On the basis of clarifications received from the bidders, ETEC opined that Technical Evaluation of the proposal of the 06 (Six) bidders may be carried out. The committee in reference to the RFP has considered the following evaluation criteria tabulated below:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount (in Rs. Cr.)
1	Estimated Project Cost	35.31
2	Minimum Technical Threshold Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per Section-7 (i) (0.5 Times of Estimated Project Cost)	17.65
3	Minimum amount required of Single completed Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least one similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) (15% of Estimated Cost)	5.30
4	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) (10% of Estimated Cost)	3.531
5	Minimum Financial capacity (Net Worth) required as per clause 2.2.2.3.(i) (5% of Estimated Cost)	1.765
6	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii) (20% of Estimated cost)	7.062
7	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1 (50% of Estimated Project Cost)	17.65

4. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and Bid Capacity of the 06 (Six) bidders are tabulated below:

10/12  



Summary of Technical Evaluation					
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Section 7) = Rs. 17.65 Crore.		Minimum amount of Similar Completed work under category 1 & 3 (Clause- 2.2.2.2-(ii) = Rs. 5.30 Crore)	Whether meeting the Technical Threshold requirement?
		Claimed	Assessed		
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd.	26.44	35.43	Yes, Project Code 'b'	Yes
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.	86.21	75.18	Yes, Project Code 'b'	Yes
3	M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.	52.74	53.5	Yes, Project Code 'b'	Yes
4	M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.	30.58	27.08	Yes, Project Code 'b'	Yes
5	M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd.	456.46	323.51	Yes, Project Code 'J'	Yes
6	M/s Satya Builders	37.88	39.03	nil	No

Summary of Financial Evaluation								
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Net Worth (Rs. 1.765 Crores)		Turnover (Rs.7.062 Crores)		Bid Capacity (Rs.17.65 Crore)		Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
		Claimed	Assessed	Claimed	Assessed	Claimed	Assessed	
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt.	5.23	5.23	16.45	14.55	41.30	43.542	Yes
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction	10.38	10.38	33.33	28.20	83.335	89.685	Yes
3	M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.	13.96	13.96	34.43	34.43	21.799	21.799	Yes
4	M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.	14.45	14.45	41.64	31.12	76.18	86.52	Yes
5	M/s Bharat Constructions	47.68	47.68	124.54	114.82#	254.68	282.39	Yes
6	M/s Satya Builders	79.49	79.49	260.47	218.12	651.775	685.19	Yes

This represents the turnover as claimed by the bidder which includes VAT/WCT for the years 2015-16 to 2017-18. This has not been reviewed as the bidder is technically non responsive as discussed in para-5.

5. Observations of the Committee:

ETEC deliberated in detail upon the clarifications received and observed that 04 (Four) no. of bidders are fulfilling the criteria of responsiveness namely M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd., M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd., M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd..

The bid of M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd. was not considered as the bidder has 03 (Three) numbers of ongoing projects in the State of Uttarakhand under NHIDCL and hence the bidder does not qualify for the next stage of bidding process as per RFP Clause 2.1.15. Further, M/s Satya Builders is considered to be technically non-responsive as the bidder does not satisfy minimum technical threshold for similar work as per Section-7 and Clause 2.2.2.2(ii) of the RFP.

Hence, 04 (Four) numbers of bidders are declared technically responsive and qualify for the next stage of bidding process, details of which are tabulated below:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Responsiveness
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd.	Technically responsive
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.	Technically responsive
3	M/s Spar Geo Infra Pvt. Ltd.	Technically responsive
4	M/s Sai GR Impex Pvt. Ltd.	Technically responsive
5	M/s Bharat Constructions (India) Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Non- responsive
6	M/s Satya Builders	Technically Non- responsive

Meeting ended with Vote of thanks to Chair.


Sanjeev Malik
(ED-III)
Convenor


A. K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member


V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member Secretary


Mahesh Gupta
DGM (Fin)
Member

