National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

Minutes of Meetings of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) for "Construction of two lane with hard shoulder of Kohima-jessami Road on NH-29 (Old NH-150) from existing km 53.220 (near Kikruma Village) to existing km 76.320 (near Mesulumi Village) [Design Km 51.5 to design Km 74.2] [Design Length - 22.7 Km] in the state of Nagaland Under Bharatmala Pariyojna on EPC Mode (Package III)" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi on 24.02.2020

- 1. The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were physically received on scheduled bid due date as 14.02.2020 at 1100 hrs.
- **2.** Empowered Technical Bid Opening Committee (ETBC) met to open the technical Bids on 17.02.2020 at 1100 hrs. The following bidders have submitted their bids physically and online.

(i) M/s SIPL-RMN (JV)

(viii) M/VKS-NIPL (JV)

(ix) M/s Varaha-OIA (JV)

(iv) M/s KKB-Shanti (JV)

3. The Evaluation Committee has considered the following Criteria for evaluation of the bids for the above project

| Sr.No. | Particulars | Amount in Rs. Cr. |
|--------|---|---|
| 1 | Estimated Project Cost | 243.04 |
| 2 | Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) | 364.56 |
| 3 | Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 218.74 |
| 4 | Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 72.91 |
| 5 | Minimum required amount of COMPLETED Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least one similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) | 60.76 |
| 6 | For a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 , the Capital Cost of the project should be more than (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (c)) | 24.30 |
| 7 | Minimum required amount of self constructed project by the Bidder for a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d)) | One half of the Project Cost of eligible projects as defined in clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d). |
| 8 | 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)) | 24.30 |
| 9 | Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3 | 12.15 |
| 10 | Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 7.29 |
| 11 | Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 2.43 |
| 12 | Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii) | 48.61 |
| 13 | Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 29.16 |
| 14 | Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 9.72 |
| 15 | Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1 | 243.04 |
| 16 | Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 145.82 |
| 17 | Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i) | 48.61 |

4. The Evaluation Committee in its first ETEC during evaluation has found that some of the data/information provided by the Bidders is not adhering to the clauses given in the RFP document. Accordingly, it is recommended that the clarifications may be sought from the Bidders as per clause no 3.1.4 of the RFP to facilitate the evaluation process.

Ajays

My

Augh

/2

5. In light of the above, the remark of ETEC w.r.t the clarification to be sought is as below:

| S.No | Name of the Bidder | Observations | The following clarification may be sought |
|------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | | from the bidder |
| 1 | M/s VKS-NIPL (JV) | 1. Annexure –IX uploaded as addendum | 1. Linking up of relevant document in support |
| | | regarding the number of works of NHIDCL in hand with the contractor could not be located. | of number of works of NHIDCL |
| | | 2. The Statutory Auditor's certificate attached | 2. The UDIN no. of the document submitted |
| | | submitted by M/s VKS does not have UDIN | certified by Statutory auditor to be submitted |
| | | number (net worth, Turnover and eligible | by the bidder. |
| | | projects). | |
| 2 | M/s SIPL-RMN (JV) | 1. Completion certificate for the eligible work | The document is to be submitted by the |
| | | duly signed by the authority has not been | bidder. |
| | | submitted by M/s SIPL and M/s RMN | |
| 3 | M/s Varaha-OIA (JV) | 1. Completion certificate for the eligible work | The documents may be asked to be |
| | | duly signed by the authority has not been | submitted by the bidder. |
| | | submitted by M/s Varaha. | |
| 4 | M/s KKB-Shanti (JV) | 1. Annexure –IX uploaded as addendum | 1. Linking up of relevant document in support |
| | | regarding the number of works of NHIDCL in | of number of works of NHIDCL |
| | | hand with the contractor could not be located of | |
| | | both the bidders of the (JV). | |

6. Consequent to submission of the clarification by the contractor, another meeting of the ETEC shall be convened again. To assess the Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the bidders.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahulwalia (ED-I)

Chairman

A.K. Singh (GM-Tech)

Member

Member

Mahesh Gupta

DGM -Fin.

Member