

RAJ HAR GOPAL & CO.

06.11.2018

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS

To.

Shri. Y. C. Srivastava, General Manager (Tech)

National Highway & Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd.

PTI Building, 3rd Floor, 4,

Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001

SUB: RFP FOR "CONSTRUCTION AND UPGRADATION INCLUDING SPECIALIZED SLOPE TREATMENT OF EXISTING ROAD TO 2-LANE WITH PAVED SHOULDER FROM EXISITING KM. 458.900 TO KM. 459.475 (DESIGN CH 456.200 TO CH 456.800) OF PATALGANGA LANDSLIDE OF NH-07 UNDER CHARDHAM PARIYOJNA ON EPC BASIS IN THE STATE OF UTTARAKHAND. (DESIGN LENGTH = 0.600 KM)".

Dear Sir,

Kindly refer to the appointment of Raj Har Gopal & Company as the financial consultants for the above captioned project.

We are pleased to attach with this letter our evaluation report after review and examination of Bids submitted by the Bidders for the above captioned project. While undertaking the evaluation we have followed the guidelines given in the RFP.

Please feel free to contact us in case you require any clarification.

SOPAL

We always look forward to work with NHIDCL and also assure you of our best services at all times.

Thanking You,

Yours Sincerely,

For Raj Har Gopal & Co

(Chartered Accountants)

Authorised Signatory

Encl:- As above

G pc1)

Website: www.rajhargopal.com

"CONSTRUCTION AND UPGRADATION INCLUDING SPECIALIZED SLOPE TREATMENT OF EXISTING ROAD TO 2-LANE WITH PAVED SHOULDER FROM EXISITING KM. 458.900 TO KM. 459.475 (DESIGN CH 456.200 TO CH 456.800) OF PATALGANGA LANDSLIDE OF NH-07 UNDER CHARDHAM PARIYOJNA ON EPC BASIS IN THE STATE OF UTTARAKHAND. (DESIGN LENGTH = 0.600 KM)".

EVALUATION REPORT ON REVIEW OF BIDS RECEIVED

November, 2018

RAJ HAR GOPAL & CO CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SL. NO.	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO.
1.	PROLOGUE	3
2.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	4
3.	EVALUATION PROCESS	5
4.	EVALUATION OF BIDDERS	7
5.	SUMMARY SHEET OF EVALUATION	10
6.	CONCLUSION	11
7.	ANNEXURE A- TEST OF REPONSIVENESS	12
8.	ANNEXURE B- TECHNICAL CAPACITY SHEETS	13
9.	ANNEXURE C- FINANCIAL CAPACITY SHEETS	14
10.	ANNEXURE D- BID CAPACITY DETAILS	15



Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

1. PROLOGUE

Raj Har Gopal & Co, New Delhi has been appointed by the Authority for the evaluation of "Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)"

The Authority is engaged in the development, maintenance and management of National Highways and as part of this endeavor, the Authority has decided to undertake "Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)" and has decided to invite bids under Single Stage Two cover system for selection of a bidder to whom the Project may be awarded.

The Authority has received documents from four Bidders for the above mentioned project. Details of Bidders are as follows

SN	Name of the Applicant/ Bidder	Type of Applicant/Bidder (Single Entity/Joint Venture)
1.	Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Single Entity
2.	Bharat Construction	Single Entity
3.	KCC Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.	Single Entity
4.	Nagyan Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Single Entity



Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

S.N	Particulars	In Crores
1.	Estimated Project Cost	41.83
2.	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	41.83
3.	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)	10.46
4.	Minimum Net Worth required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (i)	2.09
5.	Minimum Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	8.36
6.	Minimum Required Bid Capacity as per clause 2.2.2.1	41.83
7.	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))	4.18
8.	Minimum required amount of self constructed project by the Applicant/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
9.	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))	4.18



Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

3. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluations have been carried for 4 (four) bids. The evaluations of proposals have been carried out in the following manner:

- Tests of Responsiveness as per RFP
- Computation of Threshold Technical Capability and
- Computation of Financial Capability
- Assessment of Bid Capacity

The RFP evaluation has been broadly guided by the RFP document issued for this project.

It is to be noted that the determination of the Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and Bid Capacity of Bidders has been undertaken entirely on the basis of the submitted Bids and no independent / physical verification of the information provided in the same has been undertaken.

Guidelines for Evaluation

- 1. In case of Category 3 and 4, if work is done in Joint Venture by an Bidder, the receipts and payments are restricted to the share of Bidder as per footnote to point 14 of Annex-IV to Appendix-1A and the also the **share of Total Project Cost** of the Project is considered as required for eligibility mentioned in clause 2.2.2.4(ii). However In case Statutory Auditor certifies that, the work of other member(s) is also executed by the applicant, then the total share executed by applicant can be considered for determining eligibility as per provision under clause 2.2.2.2 (ii).
- 2. As per RFP, last five years considered for evaluation are 2017-18/2017, 2016-17/2016, 2015-16/2015, 2014-15/2014 and 2013-14/2013.
- 3. As per point 6 of Annex-II to Appendix-1, in no case shall the cost of maintenance and repair, operation of Highways and land be included while computing the Experience Score of an Eligible Project. Some Projects with nomenclature like PR, OR, FDR, SR, earthwork, site grading, road fencing/boarder fencing, micro/site grading works, permanent protection work, external pre stressing, surface renewal, repair of central hinge, temporary restoration etc. which appears to be related to include cost of maintenance and repair, operation of Highways are **not considered** as Eligible Projects.
- 4. If the project name reveals that the construction of roads NH/ SH under CRF under ISC/ IE, SARDP, LWE, stand alone ROB bridges, tunnels w.r.t roads may be considered under category -3. The projects with the title of PMGSY road, link road, city roads, rural road and other roads in which nature of highway is not clear may be considered under category -4
- 5. In case the estimated cost of project and revised cost of project is provided, the revised cost of project has been considered for evaluation.
- 6. In case the certificates submitted by the Bidders do not mention the word "Statutory Auditor", the Statutory Auditor has been identified from the annual reports submitted by the Bidder / Member. The certificate has been accepted in case the firm of Statutory Auditor mentioned in

Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458,900 to Km. 459,475 (Design Ch 456,200 to Ch 456,800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

- the latest annual report of the Bidder / Member is the same as the one who has signed the supporting certificates.
- 7. In case the statutory auditor/client certificates provided for category 1, 2, 3 & 4 as supporting documents are not strictly as per the format provided in the RFP (Annex IV (para-13 & 14) of Appendix 1A but provide all the information required, the same have been accepted for evaluation purpose and/or any requisite information is missing, clarifications were sought for the same.
- 8. For calculation of value of B, value of work completed is considered as zero if Bidder is qualifying the criteria of Bid Capacity; otherwise certificates submitted by the Bidders are checked and Bid capacity is calculated accordingly.
- 9. For qualification under 2.2.2.2 (ii), road protection works/ excavation works/ treatment of landslides done for NH/ SH/ Tunnel are also considered as completed projects. The same was discussed with the Authority.
- 10. As per the RFP, For a project to qualify as an Eligible Project under Categories 1 and 2, It should have been undertaken as a PPP project on BOT, BOLT, BOO, BOOT or other similar basis for providing its output or services to a public sector entity or for providing non-discriminatory access to users in pursuance of its charter, concession or contract, as the case may be. If the submitted Project Experience certificate and other supporting documents do not specifically establish the same, however the Statutory Auditor has provided the certificate as per the Format required for PPP Projects (BOT, BOLT, BOO, BOOT or other similar projects) and the nature of the project is mentioned in Annex-IV, the experience score related to those projects has been considered under these categories as the RFP does not specifically provide for mentioning the nature of the project in the supporting certificate as per Annex IV (para-13) of Appendix 1A.

Circulation of this Report

The report is strictly confidential and just being issued to NHIDCL for their use. In case this report is copied, disclosed or circulated, or referred to in correspondence or discussion with any person other than to NHIDCL, Raj Har Gopal & Co. shall assume no responsibility or liability to such other person. This report contains selected information on a confidential basis.



4. EVALUATION OF BIDDERS

Following observations are noted with respect to various Bidders which require compliance from the Bidders before opening of Financial Bid:

I. Bharat Construction

- 1. Appendix III submitted by the Bidder is executed on 26.10.2018, however Appendix IA & IB is signed on 25.10.2018 i.e. before getting power. Bidder is required to clarify that in what capacity did Mr. Rajeev Garg has signed the documents on 25.10.2018 or provide any charter document through which Mr. Rajeev Garg is getting power on 25.10.2018.
- 2. Bid capacity calculation as per RFP is not found in the submitted bid.
- 3. Value of B Bidder has submitted the Statement showing value of all existing commitments and ongoing works verified by Statutory Auditor in respect of the Value of 'B'. However Certificates for all the projects mentioned in table for value of B for amount of work completed duly signed by the Client or its Engineer-in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer is not found in the submitted bid.
- 4. In the absence of client certificates, value of B is considered as the value of award (worst scenario). Further, in last four projects i.e. from point 8 to 11, bidder stated that appointed date is yet to be decided. Bidder has applied factor of 1.05 for these four projects. Therefore the project has been assumed to be started in the FY 2016-17 (worst scenario) and value of B is considered accordingly for these four projects.
- 5. Based on the above facts Bid capacity of the Bidder works out to be Rs 58.80 cr. (worst scenario) which is more than the required Bid capacity, therefore Bidder is considered as technically responsive subject to compliance of point 1 above.

II. KCC Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.

- 1. In an undertaking (for details of Arbitration/Litigation....) submitted by the Bidder, in para 2nd, last line, Bidder has mentioned that "the bar subsists as on the date of Applicant". (pg. 128). However initially it is mentioned that no bar subsists which is contradictory and therefore need to be clarified.
- 2. Value of B Bidder has submitted the Statement showing value of all existing commitments and ongoing works verified by Statutory Auditor in respect of the Value of 'B'. Certificates for the projects mentioned at serial no. 1, 2 & 5 for amount of work completed/ balance work, is enclosed but the same are signed by Team Leader/ Resident Engineer and not by the Client or its Engineer-in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer.
- 3. In the absence of client certificates, value of B for these three projects are considered as the value of award (worst scenario) for these three projects and accordingly Bid capacity of the Bidder works out to be (-)65.28 i.e. less than the required. As Bidder is not meeting the criteria of Bid capacity, therefore Bid submitted by the bidder is considered as technically non responsive for next stage i.e. opening of Financial Bid.

III. Nagyan Constructions Pvt. Ltd.

- 1. Bank Guarantee is required to be signed by two authorized representative of Bank; however the Bank Guarantee submitted by the Bidder in the Bid is signed by one representative of Bank.
- 2. MOA & AOA of the Bidder is not found in the Bid. Bidder is required to provide the same.

Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458:900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

3. In Annex I submitted, point 5 is missing (point 5d is required to be submitted by sole bidder also), therefore the same is required to be clarified.

4. In details of Value of B submitted, number of years for which the ongoing commitments are given is not mentioned which is required to be mentioned as per format given in RFP. Bid

capacity calculation as per RFP is not found in the submitted bid.

5. Bidder has claimed single project in Annex II & IV. Start and completion dates mentioned in Annex IV & statutory auditor certificate attached are August 2017 (for both) while as per client certificate attached there is different start and completion dates. We have considered the start and completion dates mentioned in the client certificate. Considering all above assumptions, Bidder is considered as technically eligible subject to compliance of points 1, 2 & 3 above.

Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd. (Ineligible Bidder) IV.

1. Board Resolution or any other charter document in favour of the person executing the Power of Attorney for the delegation of power hereunder on behalf of the Bidder is not found in the submitted bid which is required to be submitted as per notes to Appendix III.

2. In Annex I submitted in point 6, no information is provided which needs to be clarified.

3. As per note 7 of Annex III i.e. 'The Bidder shall provide an Auditor's Certificate specifying the net worth of the Bidder and also specifying the methodology adopted for calculating such net worth in accordance with Clause 2.2.2.9 (ii) of the RFP document', Bidder is required to submit Auditors certificate which is not found in the submitted bid.

4. Pursuant to clause 2.2.2.8 of RFP, In the Annual Reports submitted by the Bidder, Bidder has submitted audited annual reports for the years 2013-14 to 2016-17 only which implies 4 years. Further, Auditors report, Director Report, Cash Flow Statement and Notes to Accounts are not found in the audited annual reports submitted. Audited Annual report for the year 2017-18 or 2012-13 is not found in the submitted bid. Also undertaking from the statutory auditor for 2017-18 is not found in the submitted bid.

5. In details of Value of B submitted, number of years for which the ongoing commitments are given is not mentioned which is required to be mentioned as per format given in RFP.

Value of B (Bid Capacity) - Bidder has submitted the Statement showing value of all existing commitments and ongoing works verified by Statutory Auditor in respect of the Value of 'B'. However Certificates for all the projects mentioned in table for value of B for amount of work completed duly signed by the Client or its Engineer-in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer is not found in the submitted bid. Bidder is required to provide the location in the submitted bid from where the required documents can be found. In the absence of client certificates, value of B is considered as the value of award (worst scenario) and bid capacity of the bidder is calculated accordingly which works out be more than the required Bid capacity.

In Annexure-VI format submitted by the bidder, in last line following words are missing i.e. "or Concessionaire / Authorised Signatory of SPV in respect of BOT Projects. No awarded / ongoing works has been left in the aforesaid statement which has been awarded to M/s.....individually / and other member M/s and M/s

....., as on bid due date of this RFP".

Above all, In Annex II & IV submitted, Bidder has claimed only single project of Rs. 17.59 cr., however as per RFP, Bidder shall, over the past 5 (five) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date, have received payments for construction of Eligible Project(s), or has undertaken construction works by itself in a PPP project, such that

Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. 458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

the sum total thereof is more than Rs. 41.83 crore (Rupees forty one crore eighty three lakh only) (the "Threshold Technical Capacity")'. (Also in formats submitted for Annex II & IV "refer clause 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.5 & 2.2.2.7 of RFP" is mentioned)

Based on above fact, as the Bidder is not meeting the Technical capacity criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 of RFP, therefore Bid submitted by the Bidder i.e. Backbone Construction Private Limited, is considered as technically non responsive for next stage i.e. opening of Financial Bid.



8. SUMMARY SHEET OF EVALUATION

Test of Responsiveness is attached as Annexure B.

S No	Applicant/ Bidder Name	Technica l Capacity Assessed (in cr.) (Require d – 41.83 cr.)	Complete Project for 1 & 3> 10.46 cr.	Net worth assessed (in cr.) (Require d – 2.09 cr.)	Average Turnover Assessed (in cr.) (Required - 8.36 cr.)	Bid Capacity (in cr.) (Required – 41.83 cr.)	Responsive/ Non- Responsive
1.	Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd.	17.59*	Project code a	13.31	35.41	48.87	Technically Non Responsive**
2.	Bharat Construction	258.92	Project code m	40.38	87.42	58.80	Technically Responsive/ Eligible***
3.	KCC Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.	899.56	Project code a	241.40	617.45	(-)65.28**	Technically Non Responsive**
4.	Nagyan Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	94.79	Project code a	2.71	18.93	198.69	Technically Responsive/ Eligible***

^{**}less than required

^{***}subject to fulfilment of compliances mentioned on pg. 7, 8 & 9



^{**}Please refer pg. 7, 8 & 9

7. CONCLUSION

SL. NO	STATUS	NUMBER OF BIDDERS	REMARKS
1.	Bids received by NHIDCL	4	Please refer page no. 3
2.	Non-Responsive Bidders	2	Please refer page no. 7, 8, 9
3.	Technically Responsive Bidders subject to certain compliances	2	Please refer page no. 7, 8, 9



Annexure A

TEST OF RESPONSIVENESS

	Particulars		(a) Technic	ral BID is re	ceived onli	(a) Technical BID is received online as ner the format at	a format at	SHEET STREET	1610000							ſ
C NIO						יים אבו נוו	ב ומווומו מר	TOTAL PROPERTY.	(b) Documents	(c) lechnical Bid is	(b) Documents (c) Technical Bid is (d) Technical Bid is (f) Technical Bid (g) Technical (h) Bereint of	(f) Technical Bid	(a) Technical	(h) Boroint of	100	
S NO.	Name of the Applicant	Appendix-I	Annex-I	Annex-II	Annex-III	Annex-IV	Annex-V	Annex-VI	listed at clause 2.11.2 are	accompanied by the	Appendix-I Annex-II Annex-VI Annex-V Annex-V Annex-VI listed at clause accompanied by the accompanied by the accompanied by the contain all the list does not cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list does not cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of cost of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid and accompanied by the contain all the list of Bid accompanied by	contain all the	remains the Bid does not Cost of Bid integrity information	Cost of Bid	integrity	
1	Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd.	>	>	>	>	>	>	z	>	Å		2	Contain any	document or	Pact (duiy	_
2	Bharat Construction	>-	>	>	>	>	>	>-	>	>	>-	z	>	>	>	_
												The Sales and the sales				
3	KCC Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>-	Z	>	>	>	_
8			THE REAL PROPERTY.													
4	Nagyan Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	>	z	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	z	>-	>	>	Т



Annexure B

TECHNICAL CAPACITY SHEETS

Chargeoy Parce P		Construction and Upgradat	tion includ	ing s)eciali	zed slor	e freat	ment o	f existi	100	d to 2-lane	Back	Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd.	struction	Pvt. Ltd.										
Category 1							2		Chan	rdham	Pariyojna	on EPC ba	sis in the st	rom Exisiti ate of Uttar	ing Km. 45 rakhand. (58.900 to K Design Ler	m. 459.47.	75 (Design Cl 00 km)	h 456.20	00 to Ch	456.800) or	f Patalganga	ı Landsl	de of NH.	-07 under
Cauggory 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Category		Fac	tor									Limit (in Rs. Crore)						Minin	num Technic	al Criteria to	be satisfi	Po	
Chapter 2 Chapter 3 Chap		Category 1		Ξ.	Q					P. SO.	oject experience	on Eligible Projects nder Clause 2:2:2.	s in highways .6 (i)	81.8				Minimum thresho	old technical	capability (C.	lause 2.2.2.2 (i)) i	in crore = Rs. 41.8			
Category 1 Category 2 Category 3 Category 4 Category 4 Category 4 Category 4 Category 4 Category 4 Category 6 Category 7 Cat		Category 2		0	٥					P. di	oject experience o	on Eligible Projects Tause 2.2.2 6 (i)	s in core sector	4.18				Minimum threshh Rs. 10.46	rold technica	l capability fi	om Category 1 ar	nd/or 3 in a single of	ompleted pro	ect (Clause- 2.2	2.2.2-(ii)) in eron
Cutting Cutt		Category 3		5.	Q.					J #	instruction experi	ence on Eligible P	rojects in use 2.2.2.6 (ii)	4.18											
Name of the Project Name of the Project		Category 4		C	ρ					0 %	instruction experi	ence on Eligible P. nder Clause 2.2.2.	rojects in core 6 (ii)	4.18											
Claric C	S		Namo of	۵	3	Pena					-	2	7	1 1	5	9	8	10	12	13			7	15 = 13 Y 14	
Clear Clea	Z		i dilli		40	rybe	Line annu	ing rinani	cial rears	_	ype of Experie.	nce (Rs crores)	Eligible Projects		Factor	Experience	Experience		_	_	_	Date of	FPC of the		L
1	Ę	-	Client		r O	Year-1 Y :017-18/ 26 2017 ;	Y car-2 Y 16-17/ 20 2016 2	(car-3 Y 115-16/ 20 2015 2	'ear-4 Y 114-15/ 20 2014 2		Payments received for instruction of 1	Value of self construction in Sligible Projects		Score (Claimed by Applicant)		Score (Total Assessed by FC)	Score (Pending out of Assessed by FO				Commenceme t of the Projec	Completion of the Project/PCOD	Project		
C a 1.23 &44 Projects Pro					_	_	-				category 3 &	2			100				T			Completion			Damad
Weakern Parlingmager 3 3.84 7.40 6.35 0.00 0.00 17.59 1.00 17.59 1.15 20-Reb-15 31-Jan-18 17.54 Whether meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria											•	-		1,2,3 & 4 Projects		1,2,3 &4 Projects	1,2,3 &4 Projects	1,2,3 &4 Project (3-10)	8			Date			
Weistern Rahway, Partique gar a. i. 3. 3.84 7.40 6.35 0.00 0.00 17.59 1.00 17.59 0.00 Yes. 1.15 30-beb-15 31-Jan-18 17.54 Partique gar Weistern meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria Weistern meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria Ing the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria of one single-completed work of Ra. in crores 10.46	-	Balance Earthwork in bank cutting for formation, Yards, Trolley refugees &	2.0																						
Partipropager Partipropage		bridge approaches etc. and construction fextension of Minor Bridges, RUHs, Side drains. Toe walk Returning walls	Western le Railway,	_	m					007	18.60	000	09 X	17 50	100	17.50									
Whether meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria er meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria or meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria of one single completed work of Rs. in crores 10.46.		protection works from km commes connection with Construction of New BG line Between Chhotsaudouschlase	Partaphagar 5												000	601		0,00		_	20-Feb-15	31-Jan-18	17.54	20.17	
(m) (m)				T	1		+	-	+	+	Tots			95.5		17.50				-					
										1				65.11		60.11									
				Wheth	er mee	ting the M	inimum	Technica	I Thresh	old Crite	ria														
		Whether mee	eting the Mini	imum i	echnic	al Thresho	old Criter.	ia of one	single o	omplete	1 work of Rs.	in crores 10.4	9						Yes B.	ofer Project	"c" about				



	101	
" and advanced	Struction	
	_	
OLON	MI/S DIJALA	
MAIN	IVI/S	

_	Category		Factor	<u>_</u>								Limit (in Rs. Crore)						Minimun	Minimum Technical Criteria to be satisfied	Criteria to be	satisfied		
	Category 1		1.00						Project experiene sector that qualify	Project experience on Eligible Projects in highways sector that qualify under Chause 2.2.2.6 (i)	s in highways 6 (i)	4.18				Minimum threshold technical capability (Clause 2.2.2.2.0) in erore*	I technical ca	pability (Clau	tse 2 2 2 2 (t)) in c	rore= Rs. 41.83			
	Category 2		0.70						Project experienc that qualify under	Project experience on Eligible Projects in core sector that qualify under Clause 2.2.2.6 (j)	s in core sector	4.18				Minimum threshhold technical capability from Carcears 1 and or 3 in a single completed project(Clause-2.2.2.2-4(ii) in core = Rs. 10.46	ld technical	apability from	n Category 1 and	or 3 in a single c	ompleted proje	ct(Clause- 2.2	.2.2-(ii)) in
	Category 3		1.00						Construction exp highways sector t	Construction experience on Eligible Projects in highways sector that qualify under Clause 2.2.2.6 (a)	rojects in susc 2.2.2.6 (ii)	4.18											
	Category 4		0.70						Construction exp sector that qualify	Construction experience on Eligible Projects in core sector that qualify under Chause 2.2.2.6 (ii)	rojects in core .6 (ii)	4.18											
3	Name of the President	Jones of	9	3	Fynanian	dunian B	Fernandance during Pinconfeial Vaces	200	Trans of Business	2	4	8	50	9	œ :		I -	51			Ξ	15 = 13 X 14	16
. o		Client	< L L	e O	Year-1 Year-2 2017-18/ 2016-17/ 2017 2016 1.00 1.05	2 Year-3 17/ 2015-16 2015	3 Year-4 16/ 2014-12 5 2014	car-5 13-14/ 2013	О Ш	Payments Value of self received for construction in Construction of Eligible Projects ligible Projects in category 1 &	Engible Properts for EPC Assessed	Experience Score (Claimed by Applicant)	Factor	Score (Total Assessed by FC)	Experience Score (Pending out of Assessed by FC)	Experience Score (Rejected by FC)	Whether completed in the last 5 years		Date of Commencemen Fof the Project	Date of Completion of the Project/PCOD/ Likely Completion	EPC of the Project	Updated EPC of the Project	
									4	i.		1,2,3 & 4 Projects		1,2,3 &4 Projects	1,2,3 &4 Projects	1,2,3 &4 Projects (3-10)				Date			Kemarks
	Improvement & Strengthening of State Roads of Utrakhand under UPRIP Phase II, Contract Pkg no. 18 in Pauri	PWD,UK	4	8 8	0000	80'0	86.9	5.33	14.51	0000	14.51	12.39	0.70	10.16	0.00	2.23	Yes	1.40	25-Mar-10	20-Jun-14	33.02	46.23	Ē
0 0 = E E E	1 Package 14 for improvement trengthening of (i) Nalikhan- khet Motor Road (ii) Dotyal- Motor Road and (iii) Kotdwar- Motor Road	PWD,UK	4	4 7	67 0 75	= 8	1 4.63	0.97	20.44	0.00	20.44	18.33	0.70	14.31	0.00	4.02	Yes	1.20	23-Jan-14.	14-Nov-15	<u></u>	21.38	ž
m	for improvement and (i) Liti-Market-Liti (ii) Bhani-Rithwada) Bageshwar-Kapkot	PWD,UK	4	2 X(1.0)	00 D	16.74	3.38	00'0	32.28	0.00	32.28	30.10	0.70	22.60	00'0	7.50	Yes	1.15	26-Aug-14	3-Jun-16	61 F,	33.57	ž
4 0 % 5	Concrete Lining and Other appurtenant Irrigation works of Tambakhani Tunnel at department, Uttarkashi under Varunavar Treatment UK		m ====================================	~	000	2.89	429	4.77	13.84	00.0	13.84	11.95	00'1	11.95	000	00'0	Yes	1.20	3-Apr-13	15-Dec-14	= 65	14.33	Ē
2 X X 4 D	Road Protection Work on Hill side and NI Valley side in Km 0.00 to 36.00 and 41.00 to 88.00 of NH 87 in the state of	NH division of PWD, UK	m 9	m,	900	00 0	77.7	0.62	89'6	00.00	8976	8.30	1.00	8.39	00'0	00'0	Yes	1.20	3-Mar-14	15:Sep-14	÷ x	10.08	Ē
© ≥ Z	de Protection Work on Hill side and ley side in Km 220.00 to 234.00 on 87 in the state of UK	PWD, Haldwani	- ·	т,	100	2.78	5.80	00:00	10.79	00.0	10.79	9.59	1.00	9.59	0.00	00'0	Yes	1.20	3-Mar-14	15-Feb-16	97	12.48	ž
r 8 2 2 2	eshwar-Kapkot- Road under the state of	UEAP. PWD. UK	m. 34	7	5.8	19.7	09:0	000	9.90	00.00	0676	9 28	0.70	6.93	00'0	2.35	Yes	1.15	8-Oct-14	30-Nov-16	7.13	8.20	
& % X D D	ion of Khirsu-Khedakhal- nkhara Motor Road under O.C-29 in the state of	UEAP. PWD, UK	m. =	7	, A	67 7	0.21	0.00	13.04	00.00	13.04	12.20	0.70	9,13	0.00	3.07	Ys	1.15	20-0et-14	19-Apr-16	- X	13.57	Work seems to be related
0	ion of Tharali-Dewal- fotor Road under Pkg no OC-33 in the state of	UEAP, PWD, UK	rr. -	7	× × ×	60.111	00.00	0.00	23.48	0.00	23.48	22.03	0.70	16.44	00'0	5.59	Yes	1.15	21-0et-14	27-May-17	19.36	22.15	construction of normal road, therefore
8 1 4 2	tion of Buwakhal Pauri Gaja Jajal Motor Road under AP/PWID/C-33 in the state of	UEAP. PWD, UK	m -	7	E 90	× 51	2 0.52	00'0	14.89	0.00	14.89	13.74	0.70	10.42	00'0	3.32	Yes	1.15	20-0ct-14	16-Apr-16	7	15.42	considered in
=		UEAP. PWD, UK	m.	-7	252	000	00:00	000	10.72	00:00	10.72	10.33	0.70	7.50	000	2.83	Yes	01.1	25-Fcb-16	24-Aug-17	2	10.05	
0 2 2 2 2 3	nnel-1 work along sel at KM 12.732 to Four Laning of Section of NH-21	II. &PS	-	٠٠.	170 1201	7 -	4.91	7.09	43.44	0.00	43.44	80 S4	00'1	39.54	0000	000	ž	1.20	7-0et-13	in Progress	8 =	121.20	Z

	Remarks		in.	=				
Updated EPC of the Project		S9.33 Nil	56.01 Nil	175.50 Nil	9.47 Ni			
EPC of the Updated Project EPC of the Project		96.50	1099	117.00	9.02			
Date of E Completion of the Project/PCOD/ Likely	Completion	20-Mar-18	in Progress	14-Mar-14	25-Oet-17			
Date of Date of Commencemen Completion of tof the Project the Project/PCOD/Likely		27-0et-16	4-May-17	9-May-07	20-Feb-17 -			ode "m"
		1.05	1.00	- 50	1.05		Vac	roject C
	+	Yes	Š	Yes	Yes			Yes. Refer Project Code "m"
Experience Experience Score Whether Score (Rejected by FC) completed (Pending out and Assessed by FC) completed in the last 5 of Assessed by FC)	1,2,3 &4 Projects (3-10)	0.00	00'0	1.54	0000	32.47		*
Experience Score (Pending out of Assessed by FC)	1,2,3 &4 Projects	00.00	00'0	00'0	00.0			
Experience Score (Total Assessed by PC)	1,2,3 &4 Projects	41.75	33.10	8.11	9.02	258.92		
Factor		1.00	1.00	0,70	1.00			
Experience Score (Claimed by Applicant)	1,2,3 & 4 Projects	41.75	33.10	\$9.6	9.02	291.39		
		11.75	33.10	1.58	9.02			9
Type of Experience (Rs crores) Eligible Projects Payments Value of self for EPC received for construction in Construction of Eligible Projects In caneony 1.8	. 7	0.00	00.00	00:00	00.00	-		Whether meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria of one single completed work of Rs. in crores 10.46
Type of Experience (Rs crores) Payments received for construction in Construction of Eligible Projects Elicible Projects in category 1 &	in category 3 &	41.75	33.10	11.58	9.02	Total	teria	ted work of Rs.
О д	1.20	00.00	000	9.65	00.00		Whether meeting the Minimum Technical Threshold Criteria	comple
	1.15	00:00	00:00	0.00	0.00		ical Thre	ne single
Year-3 Year-4 2015-16/ 2014-15/ 2015 2014	1.10	00:00	0.00	00:00	0.00		m Techn	eria of o
Year-2 2016-17/ 2	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		Minimu	hold Cri
Expe Year-1 2017-18/ 2 2017	1.00	41.75	33.10	000	20.6		eting the	cal Thres
A G G -		т.	m m	4	m m		ther me	Technic
a 10-0	0 - U 0 7 e	E	=	٥	c.		Whe	inimum
Name of Client		PWD, Uttrakhand	PWD, Uttrakhand	M.S Satluj Jal Vidyut Nigam Ltd	UEAP, PWD, UK			ing the Mi
Name of the Project	¥	Treatment of Landslide Hazard Zones of Sakindhar Devprayag Sinking Zone Sinagar River Bark Protection on Rashicesh-Rudraprayag section of NPH-SR in the state of Uttrakhand on EPC Mode	Constrution of 2 lane road tunnel near Dat ki Devi in Km 33 & 34 of NH-27A in the state of UK on EPC Mode	Construction of Adit cum Spillway Tunnel, Cut Cover section and MS Sathj Diversion and earn of River Sathj and Jal Vidyut HRT in the lett Bank and Excavation of Nigam Lid Power House of Rampur HF Project	Protection/Treatment work on Chronic land Slide zone on Haripur-Ichari-Kwanu- Meenus Motor Road			Whether meet
S. S.		2	14	21	91			L



Ltd	
\Box	
Ţ,	
2	
=	
con P	
ilde	
Ξ.	
_	
\bar{c}	
ŏ	
$\tilde{}$	
Š	
Š	
Š	
Š	
Š	
KC	
KC	
Š	
KC	

Cutgoy Patient Patie									Z	agyan Cor	Nagyan Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Pvt. Ltd.									ľ
Category Factor	Constructio	on and Upgrad:	ation including	g specializ	zed slope t	reatment o	f existing Chardha	road to 2-la	ine with pav	ed shoulder	r from Exisi	ting Km. 45	38.900 to Kn	n. 459.475	(Design Ch	456.200 to	Ch 456.80	0) of Patalg	sanga Lan	delide of N	107
Category 1 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in highways 4.18 Project experience on Eligible Projects in norm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project experience on Eligible Projects in orm of the Project 1.00 Project 1.00		ategory	6	Tonata							100 100 100	aranialla. (Design Leng	gth = 0.600	km)					NI TO ANICO	11-07 under
Category 2 2.0				ractor							Limit (in Rs. Crore					M	inimum Tac	1.0			
Cauggory 3 1.00	5	Category 1		1.00				Project experier sector that quali	rec on Eligible Proj	ects in highways	81.4				Ainimum threshold	technical carakil		mical Crite	ria to be sat	isfied	
Category 3 1.00 Particle Category 4 1.00 Particle Category 1 1.00 Particle Category 2 1.00 Particle Category 1 1.00 Particle Category 2 1.00 Particle Category 1 1.00 Particle Category 2 1.00 Particle Particle	U	Category 2	(6)	0.70				Project experien that qualify unde	ce on Eligible Proje r Clause 2.2.2.6 (5)	acts in core sector	-				finimum threshhol	d technical carabi	ity from Category	(I) in crore - R	8. 4		
Chicagony 4 State of the Project Chicagony 4 Chica	0	Category 3		1.00				Construction exp	retience on Eligible	Projects in	-			pE.	ts. 10.46		9	and of any of the	single completed	project (Clause-	2.2.2.2-(ii)) in cron
Name of the Project Name of the Project	Ö	ategory 4		07.0				highways sector	that qualify under	Clause 2.2.2.6 (ii)	-										
Name of the Project Name of the Project				0.70				Construction exp	perience on Eligible y under Clause 2.2	Projects in core 2.6 (ii)	4.18										
Clical C	1729	of the Project	Name of P	Cg	Experience	during Finanicia	il Years	Type of Bee	2	4	1 1	S	9	o							
1			Client		ar-1 Year-2	Year-3 Yea	r-4 Vear		rience (Ks crores)	Eligible Projec		Factor		Experience E	Xperience Score			-			
1,415 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			·	C 291	7-18 2016-17. 017 2016 00 1.05	2015-16/ 2014 2015 20 1.10 1.1	+15/ 2013-14/ 14 2013 5 1.20		value of self construction in Eligible Project in category 1 &		Claimed by Applicant)			Score Pending out (Assessed by FC)	Rejected by FC)	10	or Commens tgle tofthe P	cmen Completer	tion of Proje		
11, RTS 1			000					7	•		1,2,3 & 4 Projects				2,3 &4 Projects (3-10)			Comple	etion		Remarks
94.79 94.91 1.00 94.79 0.00 0.12 Yes 1.15 17-Feb-15 25-Augd 6 115.31 Yes Refer Prince Code 2.2	1 Chemani-Nasari Tun	unel Project	+	77.	+	-	+	04 70	90.0												
94.91 94.79 0.12 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17.										94.79	94.91	1.00	94.79	0.00	010	+	-	\dashv			
											94.91		94.79		0.12	+		90		Н	
		Whether	Whe	ther meeting	g the Minim	Im Technical	Threshold Cri	teria				H		-		-		-	-		
		wiletier mee	eang the Minimum	Technical T	Threshold Cri	teria of one si	ingle complet	ted work of Rs	in crores 10.	16						×	S				
																Yes. Refer Pro	iect Code "a"				



Annexure C

FINANCIAL CAPACITY SHEETS

cr.)
0
2.09
~
Rs.
2
- 1
-
ĕ
.=
3
6
0
(Required
_
S
Details
=
e
+
0
>
Net Worth
+
e
107
130

458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in 0.02 Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. Constructions 1.82 0.91 2.73 Nagyan Pvt. Ltd. Buildcon Pvt. 204.49 241.40 36.91 KCC Ltd. Construction 40.38 40.38 0.00 Bharat the state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km) Backbone Construction 12.31 13.31 1.00 Pvt. Ltd. All reserves created out of Profits including security Reserves created out of Revaluation of assets Paid up share capital/ Partners Capital **Particulars** Misc. expenditures not written off Name of the Bidder Aggregate accumulated loses Deferred expenditure Total (1+2) premium Less: S.NO 2 4 9



0.02

241.40

40.38

13.65

0.00

0.00

Net Worth as per Audited Annual Accounts(3-9)

Claimed net worth

10

∞ 6

Write back of Depreciation and Amalgamation

Total Deductions (4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8)

0.00

(1
Share Application money pending allotment is added - 2.05 cr	Pawan Brij Ajay Gautam & Singh Yudhveer Gupta & Co.
NIC	Ajay Gautam & Co.
Bidder is a Partnership Firm so Partner's Capital amount is taken as Paid up Share Capital	Pawan Brij Gupta & Co.
Bidder has claimed Net worth based on provisional figures of 2017-18, therefore net worth of the Bidder is calculted considering Audited Annual Reports of 2016-17.	Ranavaya & Co.
Remarks (if any)	Name of the Auditor
12	13



	Annual Average Turnover in Last 5 years		35.41	35.41	35.41
	Year 5	1.2	45.49	45.49	45.49
r (in crores)	Year 4	1.15	30.96	30.96	30.96
Average Annual Turnover (in crores)	Year 3	1.1	14.29	14.29	14.29
	Year 2	1.05	28.66	28.66	28.66
	Year 1	1	41.06	41.06	41.06
Backbone	Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Updation Factor	Turnover Claimed	Turnover As per F/s	TurnoverAssessed or Claimed whichever is lower
	S.No.		1	2	3



			SI .				
				Average Annual Turnover (in crores)	wer (in crores)		
S.No.	Bharat Construction	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Annual Average Turnover in Last 5
	Updation Factor	1	1.05	111	1.15	1.2	
1	Turnover Claimed	134.97	71.71	91.05	62.16	45.99	87.42
2	Turnover As per F/s	134.97	71.71	91.05	62.16	45.99	87.42
က	TurnoverAssess ed or Claimed	134.97	71.71	91.05	62.16	45.99	87.42
	whichever is						
	lower						



	Annual Average Turnover in Last 5	years	617.45	617.45	617.45
	Year 5	1.2	484.19	484.19	484.19
(in crores)	Year 4	1.15	433.50	433.50	433.50
Average Annual Turnover (in crores)	Year 3	1.1	645.95	645.95	645.95
	Year 2	1.05	471.75	471.75	471.75
	Year 1	1	801.81	801.81	801.81
11.00	Pvt. Ltd.	Updation Factor	Turnover Claimed	Turnover As per F/s	TurnoverAssess ed or Claimed whichever is lower
-	S.No.		1	2	3



(Annual Average Turnover in Last 5	S and S	18.98	18.93	18.93
		Year 5	1.2	0.04	0.04	0.04
	er (in crores)	Year 4	1.15	2.86	2.79	2.79
	Average Annual Turnover (in crores)	Year 3	1.1	72.32	72.26	72.26
		Year 2	1.05	7.00	6.92	6.92
		Year 1	1	4.67	4.64	4.64
	Nagyan	Constructions Pvt. Limited	Updation Factor	Turnover Claimed	Turnover As per F/s	TurnoverAssess ed or Claimed whichever is lower
		S.No.		1	2	3



Annexure D BID CAPACITY DETAILS

458.900 to Km. 459.475 (Design Ch 456.200 to Ch 456.800) of Patalganga Landslide of NH-07 under Chardham Pariyojna on EPC basis in the Construction and Upgradation including specialized slope treatment of existing road to 2-lane with paved shoulder from Exisiting Km. state of Uttarakhand. (Design Length = 0.600 km)

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment

Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 41.83 Crore

	Whether Qualifying or Not	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	A x N x 2.5 - B G	105.00	130.39	170.91	198.88
Claimed	B (Rs. Cr.)	Calendar Vear for Lumover Annual Annual Assertion claimed Annual factor (Rs. Cr.) Annual factor (Rs. Cr	٠		
		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	A (Annual Turnover x Updation factor) Rs. Cr.	54.59	134.97	801.81	79.55
	A x N x 2.5 - B (Rs. Cr.)	48.87	58.80	-65.28	198.69
	N (Rs. Cr.) 1.00 87.60 1.00 278.63	2069.81	0.00		
pesse		Turnover x N B AxNx25-B Dydation (Rs. Cr.) (Rs	1.00		
Calculated/Assessed	A (Annual Turnover x Updation factor) Rs. Cr.	54.59	134.97	801.81	79.48
C	Annual Turnover (Rs. Cr.)	45.49	134.97	801.81	72.25
	Updation factor	1.20	1.00	1.00	1.10
	Financial / Calendar Year for which "A" has been claimed	2013	2017	2017	2015
		Backbone Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Bharat Construction	KCC Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.	4 Nagyan Constructions Pvt. Ltd.
	Sr. No.	1	7	6	4

