

Annexure-A

S.No	Bidder Letter No ref.	Financial Consultant M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co letter dated 20.12.2019.								ETEC
		Key Position	Objection	Name of Key Personnel	Max Marks as per the Clause	As per applicant	Marks assigned	Final Marks	Remarks	
		Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of experience in use of technology for road inspection								
1.	M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited vide letter no. VSPL/BD/TRB/TP/08-19/206-01 dated December 17, 2019		1. Experience in Mobile Bridge Inspection Unit or better technology for bridge inspection 1.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 1.2 Experience (a) 1-2 projects – 1 (b) 3-5 projects – 2 (c) >5 projects – 3 2. Experience in Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) or better technology for pavement strength measurement 2.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 2.2 Experience (a) 1-3 projects – 1 (b) >3 projects – 2 3. Experience in Mobile Bridge Inspection Unit or better technology for bridge inspection 3.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 3.2 Experience (a) 1-2 projects – 1 (b) 3-5 projects – 2 (c) >5 projects – 3	-	7	6	2	2	The bidder has claimed marks for own equipment under the criterion. However, it has been observed that the invoice submitted by the bidder at the time of technical submission was not found in order as the amount mentioned in the invoice are not legible (they are marked black and are not readable) which cannot be considered for evaluation purpose. Further, the projects claimed by the bidder at Pg No. 471 to 483 were already considered in the earlier evaluation. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	agreed
				-	2	2	0	0		
				-	5	3	3	3	The bidder has claimed marks for own equipment under the criterion. However, it has been observed that the invoice submitted	

			<p>4. Experience in Retro reflectometer technology</p> <p>4.1 Equipment</p> <p>(a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1</p> <p>(b) Own Equipment - 2</p> <p>4.2 Experience</p> <p>(a) 1-2 projects - 1</p> <p>(b) >3 projects - 2</p>	-	4	4	2	2	<p>by the bidder at the time of technical submission was not found in order as the amount mentioned in the invoice are not legible (they are marked black and are not readable) which cannot be considered for evaluation purpose. Further, the projects claimed by the bidder at Pg No. 471 to 473 & 517 to 528 were already considered in the earlier evaluation. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p> <p>The bidder has claimed marks for own equipment and experience in use of technology under the criterion. However, marks have already been awarded for this criterion in earlier evaluation. Hence, no revision of marks is required.</p> <p>The bidder has claimed marks for own equipment under the criterion. However, it has been observed that the invoice submitted by the bidder at the time of technical submission was not found in order as the amount mentioned in the invoice are not legible</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

									(they are marked black and are not readable) which cannot be considered for evaluation purpose. Further, the projects claimed by the bidder at Pg No. 485 to 496 were already considered in the earlier evaluation. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of score of Key Staff for adequacy of the Assignment										
1.		Resident cum Highway Engineer	Total Professional Experience in handling Highway projects < 12 years - 0 Marks 12 years – 16 Marks Add 1 mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 (Four) marks	E.S.A.S. Prasad	20	20	19	19	The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No 1 to 9 under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 & 9 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, projects at Sr. No. 5 & 6 cannot be considered for evaluation as they are not Highway projects (NH/SH/Expressways). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
2.		Bridge/Structural Engineer	Experience in similar capacity of modern bridge construction technology viz., Precast Segmental, Balanced Cantilever Construction, Extra dosed Bridge, Full Span Launching, Incremental Launching. Experience in 1 project – 4 marks More than one project – 5 marks	Laishram Mani Singh	5	4	0	0	The Key personnel have claimed project at Sr. No 10 under this criterion. As per Clause 3.3 Note No.2 of Appendix-EC of RFP which states that, "Only those projects (in numbers) will be considered for evaluation above, where	

									<p>the input of the personnel is not < 12 months".</p> <p>However, the duration of the project is less than 12 months, therefore, not considered for evaluation.</p> <p>Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	
3.		Road Safety Expert	<p>Total Professional Experience in handling Highway/Bridge projects</p> <p>< 10 years - 0</p> <p>10 years – 11</p> <p>Add one mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 (four) marks.</p>	Barun Halder	15	13	0	0	<p>The Key personnel have claimed that he has more than 12 years of experience under this criterion. We have re-checked and found that he has only 8 years 9 months experience in this criterion as some projects are not highway/bridge project (NH/SH/Expressway).</p> <p>Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	

Annexure-B

Financial Consultant M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co letter dated 20.12.2019.										
Sl No	Bidder Letter No ref.	Key Position	Objection	Name of Key Personnel	Max Marks as per the Clause	As per applicant	Marks assigned	Final Marks	Remarks	ETEC
Query on Evaluation Criteria for Assessment of Experience of the Firm.										
1.	M/s Technocrats Advisory Services Pvt. Ltd. vide letter No. TASPL-NVPCPL/AE/N HIDCL/2019-20/437 dated 17.12.2019	-	1. Average Annual Turnover (last 3 years) from consultancy business < 2% of TPC – 0 marks 2% of TPC – 1.5 marks Add for additional turnover 0.25 (Zero point two five) marks for every 1% of TPC above 2% of TPC subject to maximum 0.5 marks.	-	2	2	1.5	2	In the earlier evaluation, the turnover of F.Y. 2017-18 was not taken into consideration as it was found that provisional figures are provided. However, the bidder has claimed that he has provided audited turnover of F.Y. 2017-18. After re-examination, we found that the bidder has also submitted the audited turnover of F.Y. 2017-18 at the end of annual report. Therefore, the same has been considered now. Hence, the claim is accepted and marks have been changed accordingly.	Agreed ✓
			2. Nos. of Highway Professionals with the firm * <10 - 0 10-20 - 8 >20 but ≤30 - 9 >30 - 10 *The professionals who possess degree in Civil Engineering/Transport Planning /Transport	-	10	9	8	8	The bidder has claimed 9 marks under the criterion i.e. "Nos. of Highway Professionals with the firm". However, after re-examine the claim, it was found that there will be no change in marks as some of the highway professionals has not uploaded employment	

			Economics/Traffic Management / Geology/ Environment Science or Engineering and 8 years experience in highway/bridge /tunnel with employment in the firm for more than one year. The current Employment Certificate shall be uploaded by Key Personnel on INFRACON.						certificate on Infracon Portal or some has employed with some other firms, which comes to the total of 13 Nos of Highway Professionals with firm. Hence, no revision of marks is required under this criterion.	
		Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of experience in use of technology for road inspection								
1.			1. Experience in Network Survey Vehicle (NSV) or better technology for pavement inspection 2. Experience in Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) or better technology for pavement strength measurement	- -	4	2	0	0	Now also, the bidder has not provided any proof of ownership for both the technologies i.e. Network Survey Vehicle (NSV) and Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) from which it can be clearly specify that both the technologies have been owned by him. Hence, no revision of marks is required under this criterion.	
			1. Experience in Mobile Bridge Inspection Unit or better technology for bridge inspection 1.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 1.2 Experience (a) 1-2 projects – 1 (b) 3-5 projects – 2 (c) >5 projects – 3						The bidder has claimed projects mentioned at Pg No.383 to 395 for experience in use of technology (MBIU). Out of these, projects mentioned at Pg No. 384, 388, 390, 392 & 394 were already considered in earlier evaluation. However, we have re-examined the project mentioned at Pg No.386 & found that the project is considerable. Hence, the claim is accepted and the marks have been changed	

									accordingly.	
	Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of score of Key Staff for adequacy of the Assignment									
1.		Senior Quality/ Material Expert	Total Professional Experience in handling Highway/Bridge projects < 10 years -0 10 years -11 Add one mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 (four) marks.	Sushil Kumar Rai	15	15	12	12	The Key personnel have claimed that he has total 20 years of experience under this criterion. We have re-checked and found that he has only 11 years 9 months experience in this criterion as some projects are not highway/bridge project (NH/SH/Expressway). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
2.		Road Safety Expert	Experience in similar capacity in Road Safety works on Major Highway Project (similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above). < 5 years – 0 Marks 5 years – 11 Marks Add one mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 marks.	K. Badrinarayana Patro	15	15	0	0	The Key Personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No. 19 to 42 for more than 16 years of experience under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No. 34, 35, 39, 40, 41 & 42 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, remaining projects have not been considered as either many of them are not Highway Projects (NH/SH/Expressways) or in some projects no road safety works has been carried out by the key personnel. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	

Annexure-C

Financial Consultant M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co letter dated 20.12.2019.										
SI No.	Bidder Letter No ref	Key Position	Objection	Name of Key Personnel	Max Marks as per the Clause	As per applicant	Marks assigned	Final Marks	Remarks	ETEC
Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of experience in use of technology for road inspection										
1.	M/s Dhruv Consultancy Services Ltd.vide letter No.Nil dated 16.12.2019	-	<p>1. Experience in Network Survey Vehicle (NSV) or better technology for pavement inspection</p> <p>2. Experience in Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) or better technology for pavement strength measurement</p>	-	<p>4</p> <p>2</p>	<p>4</p> <p>2</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>It has been observed that the invoices submitted for both the technologies i.e. Network Survey Vehicle (NSV) & Falling Weight Deflectometer (FWD) were not found in order as proper invoice.</p> <p>Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	Agreed

Annexure-D

Financial Consultant M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co letter dated 20.12.2019.										
Sl No.	Bidder Letter No ref	Key Position	Objection	Name of Key Personnel	Max Marks as per the Clause	As per applicant	Marks assigned	Final Marks	Remarks	ETEC
Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of experience in use of technology for road inspection										
1.	M/s Ayoleeza Consultants Pvt. Ltd. Vide letter No. AYO/2019-20/NHIDCL/811 dated 18th December 2019	-	1. Experience in Mobile Bridge Inspection Unit or better technology for bridge inspection 1.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 1.2 Experience (a) 1-2 projects – 1 (b) 3-5 projects – 2 (c) >5 projects – 3	-	5	4	2	4	<p>It has been observed that at the time of Technical Bid Submission, bidder has submitted custom copy for the technology i.e. Mobile Bridge Inspection Unit (MBIU) as proof of ownership. However, as per clarification received from the bidder, it is found that now he has submitted Insurance policy paper as supporting document for the technology for ownership marks.</p> <p>Further, the bidder has also claimed projects mentioned at Pg No.390 to 411 for experience in use of technology (MBIU). Out of these, projects mentioned at Pg No. 391, 393, 395 & 397 were already considered in earlier evaluation.</p> <p>As per RFP, in the detailed evaluation criteria experience of a firm/ associate firm for a private concessionaire/ contractor (client) for technology shall be consider. Accordingly, based on the discussion held with the authority, experience of a firm/ associate firm for a private concessionaire/ contractor (client) for technology has been considered for evaluation. However, we have re-examined the projects mentioned at Pg No.399 & 401 and found that the project is considerable. And remaining projects mentioned at Pg No.402 to 411 cannot be considered for evaluation as it is not clearly specify that the bidder has actually used the technology itself but provided the technology on rent.</p>	Agreed

									Hence, the claim is accepted where applicable and the marks have been changed accordingly.	
2.		-	2. Experience in Retro reflectometer technology 1.1 Equipment (a) Equipment on MOU with Associate or on hiring basis - 1 (b) Own Equipment - 2 1.2 Experience (a) 1-3 projects – 1 (b) >3 projects – 2		4	4	3	3	The bidder has claimed projects mentioned at Pg No.414 to 435 for experience in use of technology (RR). Out of these, projects mentioned at Pg No.415, 417 & 419 were already considered in earlier evaluation. However, as per RFP, in the detailed evaluation criteria experience of a firm/ associate firm for a private concessionaire/ contractor (client) for technology shall be consider. Accordingly, based on the discussion held with the authority, experience of a firm/ associate firm for a private concessionaire/ contractor (client) for technology has been considered for evaluation. Therefore, projects mentioned at Pg No.420 to 435 may be considered now for evaluation. Hence, the claim is accepted and marks have been changed accordingly.	
		Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of score of Key Staff for adequacy of the Assignment								
1.		Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer	Experience as Team Leader or similar capacity of project Preparation including design of major highway Project (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above). < 2 projects - 0 Marks 2 projects - 11 Marks Add 2 marks for each additional project subject to maximum 4 marks.	Mr. S.K. Singh Sengar	15	13	11	11	The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No. 3, 6, & 11 under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No. 6 & 11 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, project at Sr. No. 3 cannot be considered for evaluation as the proposed Key Personnel has worked as Project Manager which is not considerable for evaluation as per Clause 3.1 Note-1 of Appendix-EC. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	

2.		Resident cum Highway Engineer	Total Professional Experience in handling Highway projects < 12 years - 0 Marks 12 years - 16 Marks Add 1 mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 (Four) marks.	Saudan Singh Parihar	20	20	16	16	The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No 1 to 8 under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No. 2, 4, 5, 6 & 7 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, projects at Sr. No. 1, 3 & 8 cannot be considered for evaluation as they are not Highway projects (NH/SH/Expressways). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
3.		Road Safety Expert	Experience in similar capacity in Road Safety works on Major Highway Project (similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above). < 5 years - 0 Marks 5 years - 11 Marks Add one mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 marks.	Omesh Chandra Mathur	15	15	12	12	The Key Personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No. 11 to 50 for 18 years of experience under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No. 11, 13, 18, 38 & 50 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, remaining projects have not been considered as either many of them are not Highway Projects (NH/SH/Expressways) or in some projects no road safety works has been carried out by the key personnel. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
			Experience in similar capacity in Road Safety Audits of 2/4/6-laning** Highway projects at different stages including at least one at design stage < 2 nos - 0 Marks 2 nos - 15 Marks Add 2.5 marks extra for each additional project		20	20	0	0	The Key Personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No. 11 to 50 under this criterion. However, the projects have not been considered for evaluation as road safety audit has not been carried out at design stage which is required as per criterion. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	

			subject to maximum 5 marks.						
			Experience in similar capacity in identification and improvement of black spots on Major Highway Project (similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) < 2 nos – 0 Marks 2 nos – 8 Marks Add 2 marks extra for each additional project subject to maximum 2 marks.		10	10	0	0	<p>The Key Personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No. 11 to 20 & 27 to 50 under this criterion. Out of these, project mentioned at Sr. No.50 were already considered in earlier evaluation.</p> <p>However, the remaining projects cannot be considered for evaluation as identification and improvement of black spots have not been carried out which is required as per criterion. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>

Annexure-E

Financial Consultant M/s Raj Har Gopal & Co letter dated 20.12.2019.										
Sl No.	Bidder Letter No ref	Key Position	Objection	Name of Key Personnel	Max Marks as per the Clause	As per applicant	Marks assigned	Final Marks	Remarks	ETEC
Query on Evaluation Criteria for assessment of score of Key Staff for adequacy of the Assignment										
1.	M/s MSV International Inc. in Association vide letter No. MSV/BD/2019/30076 dated 19 th December, 2019.	Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer	Experience as Team Leader or similar capacity of project Preparation including design of major highway Project (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above). < 2 projects - 0 Marks 2 projects - 11 Marks Add 2 mark for each additional project subject to maximum 4 marks.	Rajesh Tripathi	15	15	11	11	The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No 7 to 10 under this criterion. Out of these, projects mentioned at Sr. No.7 & 9 were already considered in our earlier evaluation. Further, projects at Sr. No. 5 & 6 cannot be considered for evaluation as they are not Highway projects (NH/SH/Expressways). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	Agreed
2.		Resident cum Highway Engineer	Total Professional Experience in handling Highway projects < 12 years - 0 Marks 12 years – 16 Marks Add 1 mark extra for each additional year of experience subject to maximum 4 (Four) marks	Vinay Kant Singh	20	20	19	19	The Key personnel have claimed that he has total 25 years of experience under this criterion. We have re-checked and found that he has only 15 years 10 months experience in this criterion as some projects are not highway projects (NH/SH/Expressway). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.	
			Experience in similar capacity		5	5	4	4	The Key personnel have	

			<p>of Highway Project of Construction/Construction Supervision/IC on EPC Mode (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above)</p> <p>1 project - 4 Marks</p> <p>Add 1 (one) mark for each additional project subject to maximum 1 (one) mark</p>						<p>claimed projects at Sr. No 4, 9 & 12 under this criterion. Out of these, no project can be considered for evaluation as they are not Highway Projects (NH/SH/Expressways). Although, we have already considered project mentioned at Sr. No.5 under this criterion and marks awarded accordingly. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	
3.		Bridge/Structural Engineer	<p>General Qualification</p> <p>I) Graduate in Civil Engineering – 21</p> <p>II) Post Graduation in Structural Engineering - 4</p>	Mukesh Kumar Singh	25	21	0	0	<p>The Key Personnel is having 2 nos. of degree (i.e. one B.E. & one B.tech) of same university (Bangalore University) of same year. However, Provisional Degree (11.09.2002) was issued after the issuance of Original Degree (06.06.2002). Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	
4.		Road Safety Expert	<p>Experience in similar capacity in Road Safety Audits of 2/4/6-laning** Highway projects at different stages including at least one at design stage</p> <p>< 2 nos – 0 Marks</p> <p>2 nos – 15 Marks</p> <p>Add 2.5 marks extra for each additional project subject to maximum 5 marks.</p>	Shripal Singh	20	20	0	0	<p>The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No 10 to 13 under this criterion. Out of these, no project can be considered for evaluation as the proposed key personnel has not carried out Road Safety Audits. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	

			<p>Experience in similar capacity of preparing Road Safety Management Plans for Inter Urban Highway</p> <p>1 project – 4 Marks</p> <p>2 or more project – 5 Marks</p>		5	5	0	0	<p>The Key personnel have claimed projects at Sr. No 17 to 18 under this criterion. Out of these, no project can be considered for evaluation as the proposed key personnel has not prepared Road Safety Management Plans for Inter Urban Highway. Hence, the claim cannot be accepted and there will be no change in marks.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	---	---	--	--