

Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) on 13.11.2018 for ““Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study, Preparation of Detailed Project Report and providing pre-construction services for Construction of 2-Lane Bridge for Connectivity of Port Blair-Chatham Island and Bambooflat with 200 mtr to 400 mtr Navigational span in the Union Territory region of Andaman Nicobar Islands”” held at NHIDCL, New Delhi.

The RFP for the above subject work was invited with bid due date on 31.10.2018 till 1500 hrs. In all, 4 (four) bids were received from the following bidders.

Sr. No.	Name of Applicant
1	M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.
2	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.
3	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.
4	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.

2. The technical bid for the project was opened on 01.11.2018 at 1530 hrs on CPP portal and INFRACON portal. During the last ETBC meeting dated 01.11.2018, ETBC decided to carry out the evaluation of the Firm's Eligibility criteria “manually” as the project includes Major Bridge, resulting in modification from eligibility criteria mentioned in Model documents. Therefore, evaluation of Firm eligibility was carried out manually.

3. As per Clause 12.1 of Data Sheet of RFP, the Average Annual Turnover for five financial year should be equal to or more than Rs. 5.0 Crore for qualification for technical evaluation. The Average Annual Turnover of the firms as per Clause 12.1 of Section-I are as below:

Sl. No.	Name of Firm	2012-13 (Rs. in Crore)	2013-14 (Rs. in Crore)	2014-15 (Rs. in Crore)	2015-16 (Rs. in Crore)	2016-17 (Rs. in Crore)	Total Turnover of Last 5 years (Rs. in Crore)	Average Annual Turnover of last 5 years Rs. 5.0 Crore for Sole, Rs. 3.75 Crore for Lead & Rs. 2.5 Crore (Rs. in Crore)
1.	M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	8.07	9.06	9.15	10.88	19.73	56.89	11.378
2.	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	28.81	32.12	36.56	34.1	35.9	167.49	33.498
3.	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	5.08	7.11	6.07	7.03	7.3	32.59	6.518
4.	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with	32.12	50	63.52	64.47	105.01	315.12	63.024
	Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	-	-	-	-	27.36	5.472	5.472

[Handwritten signatures and initials]

4. The average annual turnover of all the firms are more than the criteria for qualifying the firm's annual turnover eligibility criteria i.e. Rs. 5.0 Crore for Sole, Rs. 3.75 Crore for Lead & Rs. 2.5 Crore for other member.

5. Next, the First Stage Evaluation for ascertaining the Eligibility of firms i.e. 'First Stage Minimum Eligibility Requirement' was carried out as per Clause 12.1 of Data Sheet of RFP documents. ETEC observed that all the 4 (four) firms i.e. M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd., M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd., M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd., M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd. have become eligible in the first stage evaluation as per the criteria mentioned in RFP document. The details of evaluation carried out is placed at **Annexure-A** with Stage-I evaluation details as under:

Sl. no.	Name of Firm	Minimum Eligibility Requirement for eligibility of firms				Remarks
		A Firm applying should have experience of preparation of Detailed Project Report of two/four/six lane/Feasibility of Two/ four/ six lane major bridge projects of aggregate length equal to the indicative length (for evaluation purpose only) of the bridge under the assignment i.e. 1000 mtr	Firm should have also prepared DPR for at least one major bridge project of 2/4/6 laning of minimum 40% of the indicative length of the bridge i.e. 400 m or Feasibility Study of two/four/six laning of minimum 60% of the indicative length of the bridge i.e. 600 m	Firm should have also prepared DPR of a two/four/six lane major bridge project having a span of Minimum 100m	Annual average turnover for last 5 years of the firm should be equal to or more than Rs. 5.00 Crores.	
1	M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	Yes, 9463.60 mtr	Yes, 4 Projects (Sl. no.: 12, 18, 25 & 26)	Yes, 283.15 mtr (Sl. no. 24)	Yes, Rs. 11.378 Crore	Eligible
2	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	Yes, 17628 mtr	Yes, 6 Projects (Sl. no. 15, 17, 18, 27, 28 & 31)	Yes, 176 mtr (Sl. no. 24)	Yes, Rs. 6.518 Crore	Eligible
3	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	Yes, 24680 mtr	10 Projects (Sl. no. 2, 27, 28, 34, 35, 36, 39, 45, 46, 52)	Yes, 360 mtr (Sl. no. 52)	Yes, 33.498 Crore	Eligible
4	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with	Yes, 6002 mtr	Yes, 1 project (Sl. no. 22)	Yes, 113.40 mtr (Sl. no. 22)	Yes, 63.024 Crore	Eligible
	Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	Yes, 6744 mtr	Yes, 2 Projects (Sl. no. 19, 23)	Yes, 270 mtr (Sl. no. 19)	Yes, 5.4472 Crore	Eligible

6. ETEC during evaluation has considered all the projects having Flyover, Viaduct, RoB in mandatory qualification of Bridge criteria mentioned in Clause 12.1 of Data Sheet of RFP. Also, Operation & Maintenance period of the projects have not been considered in the supervision of work in the evaluation.

7. Further, ETEC examined the certificates of all the firms uploaded on INFRACON to assert its appropriateness vis-à-vis RFP Criteria. Claimed projects with incorrect/incomplete experience certificate were rejected and accordingly the first stage evaluation of firms was concluded.

8. Accordingly, 2nd Stage Evaluation of above mentioned all eligible firms was carried out as per Clause 12.2 of Data sheet of RFP documents. The details of evaluation carried out is placed at Annexure-A with Stage-I evaluation details as under:

a) Adequacy of approach and methodology (10 Marks)

S. No	Evaluation Criteria as Stipulated in Clause 12.2 B of Data Sheet	Maximum Marks	Name of Bidder			
			M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.
1	Site appreciation	2	2	2	2	2
2	Team composition and task assignment	2	2	2	2	2
3	Methodology (Approach and initial view on project plan including key challenges envisaged and potential solutions for) 6 marks					
3 (a)	Proposed alignment and bypasses required and land acquisition requirements	2	2	2	2	2
3 (b)	Access control, rehabilitation of existing road, drainage and utilities	2	2	2	2	2
3 (c)	Adoption of superior technology along with proof of past use vendor association	2	2	2	2	2
Total		10	10	10	10	10

b) Material testing, survey and investigation, equipment and software proposed to be used (15 Marks)

S. No.	Evaluation Criteria as Stipulated in Clause 12.2 B of Data Sheet	Maximum Marks	Name of Bidder			
			M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Suveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.
1	Availability of in-house material testing facility 5 Marks					
1.1	Available	5	-	5	5	5
1.2 (a)	Outsourced (Through NABL accredited labs/IIT/NIT labs)	4	4	-	-	-
1.2 (b)	Other than (a)	3	-	-	-	-
2	Field Investigation Facilities 5 Marks					
2.1	Available (Created in house at site)	5	-	5	5	5

L. [Signature]

Grando [Signature]






[Signature]

CC

2.2 (a)	Outsourced (Through NABL accredited labs/IIT/NIT labs)	4	4	5	-	-
2.2 (b)	Other than (a)	3	-	-	-	-
3	Office Equipment and Software 5 Marks					
3.1	Available	5	5	5	5	5
3.2	Outsourced	4				
3.3	Not Available	3				
Total		15	13	15	15	15

C) Firm's relevant experience in last 7 years (75 Marks)

Sl. no.	Name of Firm	Minimum Eligibility Requirement for eligibility of firms					Total Marks (75 Marks)
		Aggregate Length of DPR/Feasibility study of 2/4/6 lane Bridge projects 12 Marks for more than indicative length 15 Marks for 2 times of indicative length 18 Marks for 3 times of indicative length	DPR for 2/4/6 laning projects each equal to or more than 40 % of indicative length of a package applied for (or Feasibility Study for 2/4/6 laning projects each equal to or more than 60 % of indicative length of a package applied for) 1 Project: 12 Marks 2 Projects: 15 Marks 3 Projects: 18 Marks	DPR of Bridge having length more than 200 m 1 Project: 3 Marks 2 Projects: 6 Marks 3 Projects: 9 Marks 4 Projects or more: 12 Marks	Annual average turnover for last 5 years of the firm: More than 5 Cr but less than 10: 9 Marks More than 10 Cr: 12 Marks Less than 5 Crore: 0 marks	Span length of 100 mtr or more 100m to 150m: 2 Marks 150m to 200m: 4 Marks 200m to 250 m: 11 marks 250m to 300m : 13 marks 300m or more: 15 Marks	
1	M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	18	18	12	12	13	73 Marks
2	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	18	18	12	9	4	61 Marks
3	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	18	18	12	12	15	75 Marks
4	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	18	12	6	12	2	50 Marks

9. Final scores of all the firms are as under:

S. No	Name of Bidder	Second Stage of Eligibility Status			
		Firm's Relevant Experience for the assignment of last 7 years (Max. points 75)	Adequacy of approach and methodology (10 Marks)	Material testing, survey and investigation, equipment and software proposed to be used (15 Marks)	Final Score Max. Marks: 100)
1	M/s Spectrum Techno Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	73	10	13	96
2	M/s VKS Infratech Management Pvt. Ltd.	61	10	15	86
3	M/s TPF Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	75	10	15	100
4	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (Rodic) in Joint Venture with Monarch Surveyors & Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	50	10	15	75


10. In view of above, the Committee recommended uploading "Minutes of Meeting" of ETEC on website and to give 3 (three) days time to all 4 (four) bidders by communicating their technical score for clarifications/representation if any before opening of Financial opening.



V.K. Singh
ED-IV
Convener



Y.C. Srivastava
GM-Tech
Member Secretary



A. K. Gupta
GM-Tech
Member



Uttam Chatterjee
DGM-Fin.
Member



V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member



Only last 7 year projects i.e. 31.10.2011 to 31.10.2018 has been considered for Evaluation Manually

Project Sr. No As per Moved Data	Assignment Type	lane	Weightage	Association	Weightage	length (km)	Final Length (km)	No. of Bridges						Bridge details & Length as per Certificate	Remarks
								6m to 60m	60m to 200m	200m to 500 m	500m to 1000m	1000m or more			
4	DPR	-	-	Sole	1	1.62	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	Rejected in view of private firm certificate
5	Other Work	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.53	2.295	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	Rejected as incomplete certificate
7	Other Work	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.69	2.535	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	Rejected as incomplete certificate
9	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	14.89	22.335	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected, No bridge claim
10	Other Work	4	1.5	Sole	1	66.73	100.095	33	3	1	1	0	0	-	Rejected in view of private firm certificate
11	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	0.55	0.55	0	0	0	0	1	0	50m	Accepted
12	Other Work	2	1	Sole	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	Viaduct Portion-382.8m (Max. span 45m)	Accepted
14	Supervision	2	1.5	Sole	1	32	32	10	1	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected, Private firm certificate
15	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	3.8	78	10	1	0	0	0	0	Elevated portion 3860m, (Max. span 40m)	Rejected as elevation portion is not considered
16	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.82	2.73	0	0	0	0	0	1	Bridge 1142m (Max. span 50m)	Rejected as supervision work
17	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	0.49	0.735	0	0	1	0	0	0	267.50m (Max. span 25m)	Rejected as supervision work
18	DPR	4	1.5	Other Member	0.4	8	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	1	453m 1462m (Max span 232 claimed)	Accepted However, span arrangement not mentioned in attached certificate
19	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected No bridge claim
20	DPR	-	-	Sole	1	0.13	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as no bridge details mention in certificate
21	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	1.11	1.11	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	Rejected no certificate attached
22	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	0.91	1.365	0	0	0	1	0	0	300m (Max. span 150m)	Accepted
23	DPR	2	1	Other Member	0.4	35	14	6	2	2	0	0	0	-	Rejected as no bridge details mention in certificate
24	DPR	4	1.5	Lead	0.6	0.99	0.891	0	0	1	1	0	0	450m (Max span 315m)	Accepted (To be checked)
25	DPR	4	1.5	Lead	0.6	1.94	1.746	0	0	0	0	0	1	Flyover a 1637m (max span 43m)	Accepted
26	DPR	4	1.5	Other Member	0.4	9.64	5.784	0	0	0	0	0	1	Flyover a 4140m (max span 74m)	Accepted
27	DPR	2	1	Association	0.25	185	46.25	35	4	0	0	0	0	-	Accepted, However no bridge details mention in certificate
28	DPR	2	1	Association	0.25	129.15	32.2875	25	2	0	0	0	0	101.375m	Accepted, However no span details mention in certificate
29	DPR	4	1.5	Association	0.25	141	35.25	21	3	0	0	0	0	-	Accepted, However no bridge details mention in certificate
30	DPR	2	1	Association	0.25	147	36.75	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as IOA uploaded instead of experience certificate
31	DPR	2	1	Association	0.25	66	16.5	4	1	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as IOA uploaded instead of experience certificate
32	DPR	2	1	Association	0.25	28.6	7.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected no certificate attached
33	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	13.42	20.13	0	0	0	0	0	2	Elevated portion 11520m, (Max. span 40m)	Rejected as elevation portion is not considered
34	DPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Rejected as repeated project
35	DPR	4	1.5	Association	0.25	55	20.625	13	1	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as IOA uploaded instead of experience certificate
Evaluation Criteria															
1.1	11.578 km	Total 482 length		Marks											
1.2	4 projects (12, 18, 25 & 26)	40% of indicative length i.e. 400m		18			0								
2	5 projects (12,18,24,25 & 26)	Projects 200m above		12			0								
3	11.378 Cr.	Turn over more than 10 Cr.		12			0								
4	283.15 m (Sr. 24)	Span greater than 100m		13			0								

Only last 7 year projects i.e. 31.10.2011 to 31.10.2018 has been considered for Evaluation Manually

Project Sr. No As per Moved Data	Assignment t Type	Lane	Weightage	Association	Weightage	length (km)	Final Length (km)	No. of Bridges					Bridge details & Length as per Certificate	Remarks
								6m to 60m	60m to 200m	200m to 500 m	500m to 1000 m	1000m or more		
4	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	18.42	18.42	0	0	0	0	1		Rejected in view of completion date (2009)
8	F/s	4	1.5	Sole	1	188	282	122	27	5	1	0		Accepted, However, bridge details is not mentioned in attached certificate
9	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	21.92	21.92	1	1	0	0	1	1920m (Max. span 60m)	Rejected as supervision work
11	Supervision	4	1.5	Lead	0.6	13.71	12.339	0	0	0	0	1	1840m (Max. span 52.55m)	Rejected as supervision work
13	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	42.03	63.045	11	8	0	0	0		Rejected in view of private firm certificate
14	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	29.7	29.7	10	0	0	0	0		Accepted, However, bridge details is not mentioned in attached certificate
15	F/s	2	1	Sole	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	640m (Max. span 127.5m)	Accepted.
16	Supervision	4	1.5	Association	0.25	67/76	25.41	32	8	2	1	0		Rejected as supervision work
17	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.5	2.25	0	0	1	0	1	Bridge = 240m Viaduct = 2233m (Max span 110m)	Accepted
18	DPR	6	1.5	Sole	1	2.55	3.87	0	3	0	0	0	Plyover = 750m, 1030m & 800m (Max Span 45m)	Accepted
19	Other work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		Proof Checking work
20	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	128	128	125	2	1	0	0		Rejected as supervision work and QA & QC work
21	O&M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		Rejected as O&M work
22	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	104	104	25	2	0	0	0	91.5m, 185m (span not mentioned)	Accepted, However issuing date and completion date not mentioned
23	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	Bridge 180m Viaduct 2232m (Max Span 80m)	Accepted
24	DPR	2	1	Other Member	0.4	6	2.4	0	0	1	0	0	440m (Max span 440m)	Accepted however, completion date is not mentioned
25	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	14.8	14.8	3	0	0	0	0		Accepted however bridge details is not mentioned
26	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	24	24	4	0	0	0	0		Accepted however bridge details is not mentioned
27	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	68.2	68.2	27	5	0	1	0	15m, 60m, 594.75m, 140m, 158.5m & 90 = 1059.25m	Accepted
28	F/s	2	1	Sole	1	160	160	0	5	1	3	1	2035.06m, 800.15m, 550.15m, 837.2m, 320.06m, 150.05m, 60m, 70m, 80m, 80m (Max span 125m)	Accepted, However no bridge details mention in certificate
29	F/s	6	1.5	Sole	1	1.2	1.8	0	0	0	0	0		Rejected as no experience certificate attached
30	F/s	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		Rejected repeated project
31	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	58	58	0	0	0	0	0	1560m, 750m, 67.29m & 94.5m	Accepted
1.1			Total aeg. Length	Marks			0							
1.2			40% of indicative length i.e. 400m	18			0							
2			6 projects (17, 17, 18, 27, 28 & 31)				0							
3			Projects 200m above 18, 23, 27, 28 & 31)	12			0							
4			7.11 Cr. 165 m (Sr. 17) and 176m (Sr. No. 24)	9			0							
			Turn over more than 10 Cr. Span greater than 100m	4			0							
				61			0							

Monarch Surveyors and Engineering Consultants Pvt Ltd (Other member)														
Only last 7 year projects i.e. 31.10.2011 to 31.10.2018 has been considered for Evaluation Manually														
Sr. No As per Moved Data	Project Assignme nt Type	lane	Weigh tage	Associat ion	Weightag e	length (km)	Final Length (km)	No. of Bridges				Remarks	Effectiv e length	
								6m to 60m	60m to 200m	200m to 500 m	500m to 1000 m or more			
7	Other work	6	1.5	Sole	1	15	22.5	0	4	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in experience certificate nor claimed	
11	Feasibility and preliminary	4	1.5	Sole	1	31	46.5	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in experience certificate (24.10.2011 issuing date) nor claimed	
14	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	13.5	20.25	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
17	Other work	2	1	Sole	1	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
18	Execution	2	1	Sole	1	1.57	1.57	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected as the work of nature is execution	
19	Feasibility and preliminary	6	1.5	Sole	1	2.8	4.2	0	0	0	1	0	Accepted	1470
21	Other work	2	1	Sole	1	57	57	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
22	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	101.79	152.685	0	7	1	0	0	Rejected in view of no bridge span detail provided in uploaded certificate	
23	DPR	684	1.5	Sole	1	85	127.5	0	9	3	2	1	Accepted	5274.42
24	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	75	112.5	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected as LOA uploaded	
25	Feasibility and preliminary	6	1.5	Sole	1	25.7	38.55	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
26	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	24	36	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
27	Other work	2	1	Sole	1	361	361	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
28	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
29	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	67.18	67.18	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
30	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	107.3	107.3	0	4	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
31	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	86	86	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	
32	Execution	4	1.5	Sole	1	630	945	0	0	0	0	0	Rejected in view of neither bridge detail provided in performance certificate nor claimed	6734.42

Only last 7 year projects i.e. 31.10.2011 to 31.10.2018 has been considered for Evaluation Manually

Project Sr. No	Assignment Type	lane	Weight	Association	Weight	length (km)	Final length (km)	No. of Bridges					Bridge details & Length as per Certificate	Remarks	Effective length
								6m to 60m	60m to 200m	200m to 500m	500m to 1000m	1000m or more			
2	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	0.78	1.17	0	0	0	1	0	775.50m (Max Span 40m)	Accepted Rejected as the nature of work is execution	1163.25
8	Execution	6	1.5	Sole	1	14.5	21.75	0	0	1	1	0	-	Rejected, as no bridge claimed and bridge length not mentioned in attached documents	
10	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	64.51	64.51	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
13	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	0.58	0.87	0	0	0	1	0	ROB 588.35m	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
16	Supervision	6	1.5	Sole	1	3.31	4.965	0	2	0	0	0	163m, 50m, (Max Span 50m)	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
17	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.28	1.92	0	0	3	0	0	434m, 395m, 455m (Max Span 30m)	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
24	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	3.85	5.775	0	0	0	0	1	1813.521m, 766.852m, 323.020m, 404.098m, 542.928m (Max Span 42m)	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
25	Supervision	6	1.5	Sole	1	9.5	14.25	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
26	O&M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Rejected as the nature of work is O&M	
27	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	0.82	0.82	0	0	0	1	0	600m (Max Span 40m)	Accepted	600
28	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	121.22	181.83	52	0	1	0	0	ROB 320m Bridge 1092m (total 14 bridges length)	Accepted	2118
29	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	107.8	161.7	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
30	DPR	6	1.5	Sole	1	25	37.5	1	2	0	5	1	Bridge 134.12m, 89.2m, 60m, 42.5m, 9.34m, 16.4m, 11.26m, 18m, 9.245m, 42.5m Flyover 739.360m, 704.050m, 706.047m, 581.390m, 964.028m, ROB 757.216m, 446.480m, 374.711m, 43.60m (Max Span 44.60m)	Rejected in view of private firm certificate	
32	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	0.06	0.06	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
33	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	5.63	8.445	0	0	1	1	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
34	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	2.13	3.195	0	0	0	0	1	310m, 230m, 912m, 990m (Max Span not mentioned however claimed length is 180m)	Accepted	3663
35	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	0.65	0.65	0	0	0	0	0	(15*68+33.86+37.34+20+4+6.69+29+20.81+27.78+27.184+11 = 1237.66) (Max Span= 68)	Accepted	1237.66
36	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.04	1.56	0	0	0	0	0	730.1m (Max Span 20.1m)	Accepted	1095.15

37	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.34	2.01	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
38	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	7.5	11.25	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	Accepted (Bridge length is not mentioned)	
39	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.8	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1513m (Max Span 46.08m)	Accepted	
40	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	2.22	3.33	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
41	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	26.95	26.95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
42	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	5.87	8.805	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	Rejected as elevated road is not considered	
43	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	98.69	148.035	0	0	0	5	29	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
44	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	0.1	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
45	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	3.77	5.655	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3771.23m (Max Span 150.0m)	Accepted	
46	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	1.24	1.24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1240m (Max Span 120m)	Accepted	
47	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	0.54	0.81	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	545m (Max Span 210m)	Accepted	
48	Supervision	2	1	Sole	1	28.51	28.51	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
49	Supervision	4	1.5	Sole	1	41.06	61.59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Rejected as the nature of work is supervision	
50	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	7	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	320m, 510m, 1110m (Max Span 40m)	Accepted	
51	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	1.85	2.775	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	-	Rejected as no experience certificate is attached, however, work order of the project is attached	
52	DPR	4&6	1.5	Sole	1	13.64	20.46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640m (Max Span 360m)	Accepted	
53	DPR	4	1.5	Sole	1	2.68	4.02	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	500m (Max Span 220m)	Accepted	
54	DPR	2	1	Sole	1	0.44	0.44	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	200m (Max Span 200m)	Accepted	
Evaluation Criteria																	
1.1	24.68 km	Total agg. length		Marks													
1.2	10 projects (2,27,28,34,35,36,39,45,46,52)	40% of indicative length i.e. 400m		18													
2	More than 10 projects (2,27,28,34,35,36,39,45,46,47,52,53)	Projects 200m above		12													
3	33.49 Cr.	Turn over more than 10		12													
4	360 m (Sr. 52)	Span greater than 300m		15													
				75													