

## National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd

**3<sup>rd</sup> Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) dated 20.02.2019 for Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study, Preparation of Detailed Project Report and providing Pre-Construction Services for upgradation to 2 lane with paved shoulder from (i) Km 44.50 to Km 142.00 of Chattroo Village & (ii) Km 235.00 (Vailoo Village) to Km 269.00 (Khanabal) of Khellani - Kishtwar - Chattroo - Khanabal Section of NH 244**

The 6 number bids for subject project were received on the CPP Portal as well as physically by the due date i.e., on 16.10.2018 the 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Stage Evaluation results were communicated to the bidders, in which two bidders viz. (i) M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited in JV with Aushta Consulting Engineers (India) Pvt. Ltd. & (ii) Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with Monarch Surveyors and Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd & were eligible for the next stage. However, M/s L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited and M/s Jindals Consortium in Association with Advent Consulting Engineers was found ineligible, as the CV of the Team Leader was awarded zero marks as his name was not same on the Degree certificate and on CV.

2. M/s L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited, M/s Jindals Consortium in Association with Advent Consulting Engineers vide email dated and M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited in JV with Aushta Consulting Engineers (India) Pvt. Ltd. submitted the representation on the result of the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage evaluation.

### **3. M/s L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited**

3.1 Committee noted that M/s L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited claimed projects having DPR of Bridge length more than 200 m and also enclosed completion certificate. After evaluation of the representation it has been observed that project claimed by the bidder is DPR of Flyover not DPR of Major Bridge. The project at sr no 10 on INFRACON have one major Bridge of length 459 m. The same has been considered. Detail of the evaluation of the representation placed at (Annexure-I)

3.2 Regarding the mis-match in name of Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer in the submitted CV and degree certificate, the firm submitted an affidavit by the candidate and Photo identity card issued by the Government of India. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance with clause 3.2.4 (iii) (b) modified through amendment No. 2. 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. M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited in JV with Aushta Consulting Engineers (India) Pvt. Ltd.**

4.1 Committee noted that M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited in JV with Aushta Consulting Engineers (India) Pvt. Ltd. claimed projects having DPR of Bridge length more than 200 m and also enclosed completion certificate. After evaluation of the representation it has been observed that project completion certificate has been issued by a Private firm/company and was not considered. The marks scored by the firms are thus the same as communicated vide Minutes of Meeting dated 05.02.2019.



4.2 Regarding the mis-match in name of Senior Bridge Engineer in the submitted CV and degree certificate, the firm submitted an affidavit duly attested by notary. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance with clause 3.2.4 (iii) (b) modified through amendment No. 2. 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.

#### 5. M/s Jindals Consortium in Association with Advent Consulting Engineers

5.1 Regarding the mis-match in name of Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer in the submitted CV and degree certificate, the firm submitted an affidavit duly attested by notary. The Committee opined that the same cannot be considered in accordance with clause 3.2.4 (iii) (b) modified through amendment No. 2. 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.

6. The Committee observed that only two firms are technically qualified in terms of provisions of RFP and its amendment no 2. The Committee observed that there is no appreciable change in the score of 2<sup>nd</sup> stage evaluation and recommended that the following two firms as before remain eligible for the financial bid opening:

Sr. no	Name of the firms
(i)	M/s Voyants Solutions Private Limited in JV with Aushta Consulting Engineers (India) Pvt. Ltd.
(ii)	M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with Monarch Surveyors and Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to the chair.



Pradeep Sharma, GM (T)  
(Member Secretary)



Sandeep Kumar, GM (T)  
(Member)



Uttam Chatterjee, DGM (Fin.)  
(Member)



Sanjeev Malik, ED-III  
(Convener)