

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd

3RD Minutes of Meetings of Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) for First Stage Evaluation, held at NHIDCL New Delhi on 01.03.2019 at 3:00 PM for Consultancy Services for Authority's Engineer for supervision of:

- (i) Up-gradation to 4-lane with Paved Shoulder of Jammu-Akhnoor road section of NH-144A from Canal head (Km 0.800) to Ganesh Vihar (Km 6.000) of 5.2 Km length
- (ii) Up-gradation to 4-lane with Paved Shoulder of Jammu-Akhnoor road section of NH-144A from Ganesh Vihar (Km 6.000) to Hanuman Chowk (Km 30.000) of 24 Km length in the state of Jammu and Kashmir to be executed on EPC basis.
- (iii) Widening and Up-gradation to 2 lane with paved shoulder configuration and geometric improvement from km 0.000 to km 16.990 on Chenani - Sudhmahadev section of NH-244 in the state of Jammu and Kashmir to be executed on EPC basis.

For the subject project 10 bids were received on CPP Portal by due date and time i.e. on 19.11.2018 at 1100 Hrs.

2. After receiving the comments on 1st & 2nd Stage Evaluation of technical bids, the Committee met on 01.03.2019.

3. The Committee was informed that with the approval of the Competent Authority, results of 1st & 2nd Stage Evaluation along with the Minutes of Meeting were uploaded on the NHIDCL website. Applicant firms were requested to offer their comments on the Technical Evaluation within 7 days time. Representation from the bidders were received vis-à-vis the 1st & 2nd Stage evaluation results. The bidders have furnished the following comments:

3.1 M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited

Committee was informed that the bid was not considered eligible as the firm failed to qualify the minimum length criteria for project supervision. The firm vide its representation claims that 5 projects should be considered towards proof of eligibility which includes 2 nos of project which were not considered earlier.

3.1.1 Out of these 5 projects 3 are already considered while publishing the result. Among the rest two, 1st project is certified by JARDCL and IL&FS, the committee opined that the same cannot be considered for the evaluation as the employer is a private concessionaire. The project at Sl No 52, project's end date is mentioned as 19.12.2018 but the certificate is dated 17.09.2017 with more than 90% completion of the project. Hence, the second project was considered. And the firm is eligible for second stage evaluation. The revised 1st stage result is given in **Appendix-I**.

3.1.2 The marks scored by the firm & Key personnel are attached in **Appendix-II**.

3.1.3 After the 2nd stage evaluation the Committee observed that as per Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2, RFP reads, **"Zero marks shall be given to such CVs, if any of the below is applicable:**

- The CV of same person is submitted by two or more firms

L/L

Qadw

23/3/19

13

- The name of the Key Personnel is not same in the uploaded CV and as mentioned in the degree certificate and no legal document submitted for justification

The Key Personnel has any other active CV on INFRACON portal, as on the date of invitation of bid"

3.1.3.1 Accordingly as per the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) following CV's has been awarded zero marks. Details are as under:

i. Name not same in the degree certificate & uploaded CV:

| Sl No | Designation | Proposed by the Firm | Name on CV (INFRACON) | Name on Certificate | Remarks |
|-------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer | M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited | Krishan Lal Dogra | Krishan Lal | Not Exactly Same |
| 2 | Bridge & Structural Engineer-II | | Akshay Gupta | Akshay Kumar Gupta | Not Exactly Same |

ii. The following key personnel have two active CVs on INFRACON Portal:

| Sl No | Designation | Proposed by the Firm | Name on CV | Active CV in the Name of | No of CV Active |
|-------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Senior Quantity Surveyor-I | M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited | Abhay | Abhay | 2 |
| 2 | Senior Quantity Surveyor-II | | Razat Kumar | Razat | 2 |
| 3 | Bridge & Structural Engineer-I | | Ravi Ranjan | Ravi Ranjan | 2 |

3.1.4 Material Engineer-I

The minimum qualification requirement for the position of material engineer is Graduate in Civil Engineering from a recognized university whereas the candidate has submitted his qualification as degree in Construction Engineering. Accordingly, the CV was not considered.

3.1.5 The following Key Personnel failed to score 75% marks in accordance with para 3.1.3.1 & 3.1.4 above:

| Sl No | Name of Firms | Name of Key Personnel | Position |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| 1 | M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited | Krishan Lal Dogra | Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer |
| 2 | | Abhay | Senior Quantity Surveyor-I |
| 3 | | Razat Kumar | Senior Quantity Surveyor-II |
| 4 | | Harish Chandra Chaubey | Material Engineer-I |
| 5 | | Ravi Ranjan | Bridge/ Structural Engineer-I |
| 6 | | Akshay Gupta | Bridge/ Structural Engineer-II |

3.2 M/s Redecon (India) Pvt. Ltd.

3.2.1 Team Leader cum Sr. Highway Engineer

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an undertaking signed by Mr. Shaik Waris pointing out that the name in certificate & INFRACON Portal is of one and same person. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance with the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Undertaking.

3.2.2 Resident Engineer cum Road Safety Expert

The bidder claims 25 marks in the category 2 (c), i.e. for *No. of Projects of 2/4/6 Lining of 20-25 km each should have handled*, whereas committee noted that already full marks is awarded to the Key Personnel in the same category.

3.2.3 Senior Contract Specialist

The bidder claims 20 marks in the category 2 (c), i.e. for *Contract Management of a large Highway contract say over Rs.150 crore including experience of handling variation orders, claims of the contractor and there appropriate disposal*, wherein committee noted that already full marks is awarded to the Key Personnel in the same category.

3.2.4 Senior Quantity Surveyor-I

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an undertaking signed by Mr. Shashi Shekhar Mishra pointing out that the name in certificate & INFRACON Portal is of one and same person. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance to the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Undertaking.

3.2.5 Material Engineer-II

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an affidavit pointing out that the name in certificate & INFRACON Portal is of one and same person. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance with the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Affidavit.

3.2.6 Bridge Design Specialist

The bidder claims 20 marks in the category 2 (c), i.e. for *Design experience of major highway bridge of length 200 m or more (excluding approaches)*. The bidder asks to consider project Sr. No. 28, wherein the Committee noted that there is no Sr. No. 28 in the CV of the

above said Key Personnel. Hence, the ETEC opined that the marks awarded to the Key Personnel remains same.

3.2.7 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-I

The bidder claims 15 & 10 marks in the category 2 (b) & 2(d) respectively. The Committee observed that eligible marks in the above categories are already awarded to the Key Personnel in the published result.

3.2.8 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-II

The bidder claims 10 & 5 marks in the category 2 (d) & 3 respectively. The Committee observed that eligible marks in the above categories are already awarded to the Key Personnel in the published result.

3.2.9 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-III

In the RFP for the subject project clearly specified in the General Qualification that *B.E/B.Tech /A.M.I.E /B.Sc in Civil Engineering from a recognized University* is required, in the degree certificate of the Key Personnel it is clearly mentioned that his degree was in Construction Engineering and not in Civil Engineering. Hence, the CV is accorded with zero marks.

3.2.10 Highway Design Specialist

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of his two active CV on INFRACON the Key Personnel through an affidavit requests to block his duplicate ID on INFRACON, and says he has not given consent to any firm to participate in bidding process of any project under this user IDs. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of two active CVs on INFRACON, chose to submit the proposal with Key Personnel having multiple INFRACON Profiles. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Affidavit.

3.3 M/s TPF Getinsa Euroestudios S.L. in Association with Segmental Consulting & Infrastructure Advisory Pvt. Ltd.

3.3.1 Senior Quantity Surveyor-I

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an affidavit, pointing out that the name in certificate & INFRACON Portal is of one and same person along with his Pension payment order, matriculation certificate, provisional degree certificate and PAN card. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance to the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Affidavit.

3.3.2 Bridge Design Specialist

The bidder claims 12 marks in the category 2 (a) i.e. *Total Professional Experience in designing of bridge structures for highway*, wherein it was observed by the committee that all the projects with design experience has been considered for the said key personnel in the

above category. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.4 M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

3.4.1 Senior Contract Specialist

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted the Key Personnel's degree certificate and PAN card stating that Kanhaaya Dayal Singh is his full name and while creating INFRACON ID he used D as a short form for Dayal the middle name of his name. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance to the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the CV.

3.4.2 Material Engineer-I

The bidder claims experience of 24 years in the category 2 (a), i.e. for *Professional Experience in construction of Highways / Roads / Airfield Runways*. The bidder asks to consider project Sr. No. 1 to 10 except Sr No 7 as they are all highway projects, wherein the Committee noted that there is no supporting document or certificates uploaded for Project Sr. No. 1, 2, 3 & 6 in the CV of the above said Key Personnel. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.4.3 Material Engineer-II

The bidder claims 5 marks for the category 2 (d), i.e. for *Familiar with material property of road construction material, technical specifications and procedures of material tests and testing equipments*. It was observed that total 10 projects are considered in this category but while summation the same was erroneously left out. Hence, 5 marks are awarded to the Key Personnel for the above category.

3.4.4 Highway Design Specialist

The bidder claims an experience of 20 years for the category 2 (a), i.e. for *Total Professional Experience in highway works*. Committee observed that all his highway project experiences are considered for evaluation except the projects where appointment letters are attached. Though he has given appointment letter as supporting document but whether he has actually worked under the same project is not clear, hence, not considered. Again the bidder claims 20 marks for the category (c), i.e. for *Experience as Highway/ pavement Design Engineer at least 2 Projects of similar configuration*, wherein the committee observed that all the eligible projects with the similar configuration are considered for the respective category. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.4.5 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-II

The bidder claims 5 marks for the Employment with firm. It was observed that he was working with the bidder as *M/s AECOM in association with Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd* as his employer since 12th November 2012. The Committee opined to consider the same. Hence, 5 marks are awarded to the Key Personnel under the Employment with firm category.

3.4.6 The revised result of the firm is attached in **Appendix-III**.

3.5 M/s Feedback Infra Private Limited

3.5.1 Resident Engineer cum Road Safety Expert

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an affidavit where the Key Personnel states that his name is shown as Omar Farooq Ahmad in his certificate/service book while during the course of his services it has been mentioned in short as Omar Farooq/Umar Farooq. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance to the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Affidavit.

3.5.2 Material Engineer-I

The bidder claims 5 marks under the category *Post Graduate Degree in Geo-Technical Engineering/ Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, it was observed that the certificate is obtained from a college named Imperial Institute of Management Science & Research through **distance** education. Hence the Committee opined that the said degree of distance education for post graduation cannot be considered.

3.5.3 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-II

The bidder claims 10 marks under the category 2 (d) i.e. *Experience in supervision of Rehabilitation and repair of Major Bridges*, wherein the committee observed that the 4 numbers of projects i.e. Sr. No. 5, 6, 8 & 9 claimed by the bidder are already considered. On the basis of these 4 projects eligible marks are already accorded to the key personnel. Again the bidder claims 5 marks under the category 2 (e) i.e. *Familiar with modern methods of construction of bridges/ROB/flyover involving RCC/pre-stress concrete, design standards, technical specifications and statistical Quality Control/Assurance procedures for construction of different component of bridges*, wherein the committee observed that the 2 numbers of projects i.e. Sr. No. 3 & 8 claimed by the bidder are already considered. On the basis of these 2 projects eligible marks are already accorded to the key personnel. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.5.4 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-I

The bidder claims 20 marks under the category 2 (c) i.e. *Experience in similar capacity in Supervision of Major Highway Bridges on Pile/Well foundation*, wherein the committee observed that the 3 numbers of projects i.e. Sr. No. 4, 5, & 7 claimed by the bidder are already considered. On the basis of these 3 projects eligible marks are already accorded to the key personnel. Again the bidder claims 10 marks under the category 2 (d) i.e. *Experience in supervision of Rehabilitation and repair of Major Bridges*, wherein the committee observed that the 4 numbers of projects are already considered. On the basis of these 4 projects eligible marks are already accorded to the key personnel. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.6 M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Private Limited in Association with Casta Engineers Pvt. Ltd.

3.6.1 Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer



As per the CV of Col Rajeev Kumar, he has shown that he was a regular Army officer for 21.19 years and worked in BRO for 9.73 which is acceptable. However, Col Rajeev Kumar while serving in the Indian Army has shown the experience of Construction/Operation & Maintenance of National Highway & State Highways which is not correct as Indian Army does not maintain National Highways directly & the roads are being maintained by BRO. Hence the CV of Col Rajeev Kumar is incorrect/inflated and hence, cannot be considered.

3.6.2 Highway Design Specialist

The bidder claims 5 marks under the category 2 (e) i.e. *Experience in innovative / non-traditional technology and design*, wherein it was observed that in his project details uploaded in INFRACON it is nowhere mentioned that he has been involved in any innovative / non-traditional technology and design. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the Key Personnel.

3.7 M/s Yongma Engineering CO LTD In Association with Manglam Associates

The bidder claims to consider the projects into consideration projects on SI No 7, 14, 89, 108 in Experience in construction Supervision. In the previous minutes dated 15.02.2019 in para 4.2.1 the two projects 14 & 89 are already considered based on the bidders representation letter dated 04.01.2019. The remaining two projects cannot be considered under the same category. Hence, the committee opined that the eligible marks are already awarded to the firm.

3.7.1 Bridge/ Structural Engineer-I

The Committee noted that under the Clause 3.4 (iv) (c) of Section 2 of RFP the Key Personnel was awarded zero marks. In support of the mis-match in the name of Key Personnel, the bidder submitted an affidavit. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance to the above mentioned clause. The bidder despite having been aware of the modified clause whereby the zero marks were to be awarded to the CV in case of above mismatch, chose to submit the proposal with name mismatch. The bidder did not exercise due diligence while preparing and submitting the proposal. Hence, the ETEC opined not to consider the submission made through the Affidavit.

4. Through an anonymous mail received on 26.02.2019, it is highlighted that the Team Leader cum Sr. Highway Engineer proposed by M/s Feedback Infra Private Limited, Mr. Narendra Kumar Garg is blacklisted by MPRDCL (a state Govt. organization) on a letter dated 10.04.2018. According to Appendix B-5, Section 4 of the subject RFP, the firm is required to submit a clarification stating that,

"The undersigned on behalf of ----- (name of consulting firm) certify that the qualification and experience details of Shri ----- (name of the proposed personnel and address) as described in the CV has been checked and found to be correct. It is also certified that Shri----- (name of proposed personnel) to the best of our knowledge has neither been debarred by MoRTH, NHAI/NHIDCL or any other Central/State Government organization nor left his assignment with any other consulting firm engaged by the Employer /Contracting firm(firm to be supervised now) for the ongoing projects. We understand that if the information about leaving the past assignment is known to the Employer, Employer would be at liberty to remove the personnel from the present assignment and debar him for an appropriate period to be decided by the Employer".

L/L

2/11/19

Ohw

b

4.1 The Committee after due deliberation opined that as the Team Leader cum Sr. Highway Engineer is already black listed by one of the State Govt. Organization. Hence, the CV of the Key personnel cannot be considered for evaluation.


5 Further, ETEC re-evaluated 2nd stage evaluation of the technically responsive firms viz 3 nos. The marks scored by an individual firm is as under:

| Summary of evaluation of Technical Proposals | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| S. No. | Description | Maximum Marks | Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. | TPF Getinsa Euroestudios S.L. In Association with Segmental Consulting & Infrastructure Advisory Pvt. Ltd. | Yongma Engineering Co Ltd In Association with Manglam Associates |
| 1 | Relevant experience for assignments | 25 | 24.25 | 25.00 | 24.00 |
| 2 | Qualifications and competence of the key personnel | 75 | 59.41 | 63.08 | 60.01 |
| | Total marks | 100 | 83.66 | 88.08 | 84.01 |

6. In view of above, the Committee recommended that only three firms are technically qualified in terms of provisions of RFP. Hence, the three eligible bidders are qualified for financial bid opening after uploading the result on CPP portal and NHIDCL website with the approval of Competent Authority:

| Sr. no | Name of the firms |
|--------|--|
| (i) | M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. |
| (ii) | M/s TPF Getinsa Euroestudios S.L. In Association with Segmental Consulting & Infrastructure Advisory Pvt. Ltd. |
| (iii) | M/s yongma Engineering Co Ltd In Association with Manglam Associates |

Meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the chair.


Pradeep Sharma, GM (T)
(Member Secretary)


Adil Singh, GM (Tech.)
(Member)


Uttam Chatterjee, DGM (Fin.)
(Member)


Sanjeev Malik, ED-III
(Convenor)