

Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) for evaluating Technical Bids for “Routine Maintenance of Rangat to Diglipur (North Andamans) from Km 220.00 to Km 330.70 (Length= 110.7 Km) of NH-4 (old NH-223) (Maintenance Package-III) in the Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Island” - reg. held at NHIDCL, New Delhi on 04.07.2017.

The RFP for the above subject work was invited with bid due date on 24.05.2017 till 1500 hrs.

2. During the last ETEC meeting held on 12.06.2017, it was decided to seek clarification from all the five firms viz. M/s Murarilal Agarwal, M/s BABA Projects Private Limited, M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited, M/s Surendra Infrastructure Private Limited & M/s Garg Sons Estate Promoters Private Limited and to give 7 (Seven) days time to response upon the clarification. Accordingly, all the five applicants submitted their response within the specified period i.e. upto 21.06.2017. Responses thus received were examined and it was observed that clarification submitted by M/s Murarilal Agarwal & M/s BABA Projects Private Limited is accepted and found eligible wherein M/s Surendra Infrastructure Private Limited were found to be ineligible. Further, ETEC after examining the reply submitted by M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited, & M/s Garg Sons Estate Promoters Private Limited observed that there is a need of 2nd Stage clarification to be asked. Accordingly, 2nd Stage clarification was asked vide letter dated 28.06.2017, the above two firms submitted their response within the specified period i.e. upto 30.06.2017 and the same has was forwarded to M/s. KRA & Co. Chartered Accountants. Details of reply submitted by bidders alongwith comments are placed at **Annexure-A**.

3. Financial Consultant vide their letter dated 03.07.2017 has submitted final report after examining the reply submitted by bidders. Summary on evaluation of the bids submitted by the bidders including Average Annual Turnover, Similar Capacity work, Bid Capacity etc. is mentioned below:

S. No.	Name of the Bidder	Whether the eligibility criteria defined in Clauses 3 and 4 of ITB	Whether the required documents in physical form submitted by the bidder as well as the documents uploaded by the bidder are in order	Whether having the bidding capacity more than the total estimated cost of the Works i.e. Rs. 292 Lakh	At least one completed work similar nature during last 5 Years (Rs. In Lakh) of Rs. 116.80 Lakh (40%)	Achieved an average annual financial turnover equal to the amount Rs. 116.80 Lakh	Whether the bid is responsive in terms of RFP
1.	Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Responsive
2.	Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Responsive
3.	Murari Lal Agarwal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Responsive

K *h* *D* *3rd* *Oh*

4.	Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non Responsive
5.	Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Non Responsive

4. Detailed Conclusion of the report submitted by Financial Consultant and Committee is as follow:

SL. NO	STATUS	NUMBER OF Bids received	REMARKS
1	Bids received by NHIDCL	5	-
2	Non Responsive Bidders (M/s. Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd.)	1	<p>1. The DSC is in name of Ravi Rungta and the POA is in favour of Pankaj Kumar Rungta. As per RFP, in case authorized signatory holding Power of Attorney and Digital Signatory are not the same, the bid shall be considered non-responsive.</p> <p>2. The bidder Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd. has not provided Bank Certificate as per clause 4.2 (g) of RFP in required format instead it has provided the bank certificate generally for all the government projects. Therefore, the statement given by the bank do not assure that in case the concerned work is awarded to the bidder then the bank will be able to provide overdraft / credit facilities to the extent of Rs.(10% of contract value) to meet their working capital requirements for execution.</p> <p>Based on the above facts the bidder Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd. is considered as Non Responsive as per clause 4.4 B (a) (iii) and is not eligible for Financial opening.</p>
3	Non-Responsive Bidders (M/s Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.)	1	<p>Based on the clarification sought, M/s Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. is not qualified for Financial opening because Bidder does not achieved</p> <p>1. At least one contract of road i.e. State Highway, National Highway with similar or higher Bituminous work specification of at least 40% of value (Rs. 125.20 lakh) of proposed Contract within the last five years as per clause 4.4 A (b), and</p> <p>2. Minimum available Bid capacity of Rs. 313 lakh as per clause 4.6.</p>
4	Eligible for financial opening	3	<p>1. Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd., 2. Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd., and 3. Murari Lal Agarwal</p> <p>are qualified for Financial Opening.</p>

[Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink]

5. In the conclusion report of Financial Consultant and Committee, status of the bidders has been mentioned below:

Sl. No.	Status	Number of Bidders
1	Bids received by NHIDCL	05
2	Non responsive Bidders	02
3	Responsive Bidders for Financial Opening	03

6. The committee deliberated upon the evaluation report submitted by the Consultant and noted **M/s Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd. & M/s Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.** has not fulfilled the eligibility criteria, hence, declared non-responsive. The Committee therefore recommends that the financial bids of three bidders as recommended by Financial Consultant be opened with the approval of the Competent Authority.

7. The details of technically qualified bidders are as follows:

Sl. No.	Name of firm
1	M/s Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd.
2	M/s Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd.
3	M/s Murari Lal Agarwal

8. Meeting ended with Vote of thanks to Chair.



Sanjeev Malik
(ED-III): Chairman



Col. Rajeev Sood
GM(T): Member Secretary



Adil Singh
GM (T): Member



(Uttam Chatterjee)
DGM (Finance)
Member



Vivekanand Jaiswal
DGM (T): Member

Annexure-A

CLARIFICATION SOUGHT, REPLY RECEIVED AND EVALUATED

1/5. Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd.:

S. No.	Appendix / Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	4.2 (a)	<i>The bidder submitted POA at page no. 7 of scanned pdf file. The POA has been executed on 10.05.2017 on the stamp paper which was purchased on 15.05.2017. Kindly clarify</i>	As per POA Submitted by us, the stamp paper was purchased and the POA has been executed on 16.05.2017 instead of 10.05.2017, as cited in your letter, but due to some topological error, it is printed as 10.05.2017 instead of 16.05.2017. The scan copy of POA is attached for your reference.	As per the bidder, the POA is executed and notarized on 16.05.2017 and stamp paper purchased on 15.05.2017, but typographical error done for written date of execution as 10.05.2017. The notarization date of 16.05.2017 is considered as execution date and the reply has been considered satisfactory considering the typographical error on part of the bidder.	Agreed
1.	4.4 B (a)	<i>The Affidavit submitted by the bidder at page no. 201 of scanned pdf file is not exactly as per format of RFP. The words "authorize (s) and request (s)" are not written which is required as per format of RFP. Kindly clarify</i>	A fresh copy of Affidavit in stamp paper duly notarized is being attached.	The bidder has now accepted the exact format of Affidavit as mentioned in RFP. Therefore the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed
2.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<i>The bidder has submitted a copy of educational degree of all technical key personnel's, however as per requirement</i>	Earlier we have submitted Affidavit & Education Certificates of Technical Person.	The bidder has now given the detailed CVs as required; therefore the	Agreed

[Handwritten signature]


[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

		<p>of clause 4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid, the bidder should submit the detailed and signed CVs of the Key Technical Personnel's at S. No.1 (Project Manager) signed by the key personnel himself which must be uploaded along with the bid. The detailed CV has not been submitted. Kindly clarify</p> <p>The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been provided by the bidder in the information submitted at page no. 183 of scanned pdf file. Kindly clarify</p> <p>The bidder has submitted the Bank Guarantee at page 4 of scanned pdf file. However, it is not exactly as per verbatim with format of RFP. The words "All claims under this Guarantee shall be payable at New Delhi. This Guarantee will be returned to us as soon as the purpose for which it is issued is fulfilled. The BG confirmation letter no. GTEE/432003 is an integral part of the BG No. 087GT02171350002" are written which are extra from format of RFP. Kindly clarify</p>	<p>The detailed CV along with the Signature of Personnel has been attached with the letter for your kind reference.</p>	<p>reply of the bidder is satisfactory.</p>	
3.	<p>Point 1.6 of Qualification Information</p>		<p>A fresh copy of 1.6 with details of proposed position is attached for your reference.</p>	<p>As the details have been provided, therefore the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
4.	<p>Bank Guarantee</p>		<p>The above verbiage that has been written in BG is a part of the bank's norms and regulations and has been written in every bank guarantee that has been issued by the HDFC Bank and forwarding letter of HDFC bank is attached for your ready reference.</p>	<p>The forwarding letter of Bank dated 21.06.2017 clarifies that the extra words written in BG is a part of the bank's norms and regulations and therefore the same has been considered as satisfactory.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>









2/5. Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd.:

S. No.	Appendix / Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	Bank Guarantee	<i>The bidder has submitted Bank Guarantee which expires on 03.11.2017. However, as per RFP document, the Bank Guarantee should be valid up to 165 days (120 + 45) from Bid due date which is 05.11.2017. Kindly provide the extension for the same.</i>	Initial the last date for bid Submission was 17.05.2017 thus guarantee was made until 03.11.2017, the validity of bank guarantee was extension of last date of bid Submission from 17.05.2017 to 24.05.2017 accordingly which is duly enclosed with the original bank guarantee for your record. (Copy of same being enclosed for your ready reference). These clauses in bank guarantee as per bank norm and practice the letter obtained from the bank in regard is being enclosed herewith.	The extension of the bank guarantee has been shown. Therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed
2.	Bank Guarantee	<i>In the Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder, a Non Obstante clause related to non assignable and transferable of beneficiary has also been added in the submitted BG. Kindly clarify and provide the amendment for the same.</i>	As per PTU certificate it clearly reveals that Mr. Sameer Mehta has passed out of bachelor of technology in April, 2014. However the degree has issued in august, 2014. Hence he should be considered eligible technical personnel. This CV of Mr. Subash Chandra Singh (Project manager) already uploaded along with bid. The details signed copy of CV also being enclosed.	As the clause comply the norms of the bank therefore, NHIDCL may decide the acceptance or non acceptance of the same.	Agreed
1.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<i>The bidder has submitted details of all technical key personnel's, at page no. 94 of scanned pdf file. However the proposed Site Engineer, Mr. Sameer Mehta has experience of less than 3 years (i.e from Aug 2014 as per PTU certificate) as per requirement of clause 4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid. Kindly clarify</i>		The experience has been counted from the month of examination held and the Site Engineer Mr. Sameer Mehta qualifies for required experience	Agreed
2.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<i>The bidder has submitted a brief CV of all technical key personnel's, however as per requirement of clause 4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid, the bidder should submit the detailed and signed CV's of the Key Technical Personnel's at S. No.1 (Project Manager)</i>		The submitted CV of Project manager has been accepted as detailed CV.	Agreed












				signed by the key personnel himself which must be uploaded along with the bid. The detailed CV has not been submitted. Kindly clarify.	The board Resolution in regard is being enclosed.	As the Board resolution has been shown therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed
3.	4.2 (a)	In the POA submitted by the bidder, Mr. Nitin Garg has authorized Mr. Rahul Garg as Authorized Signatory on behalf of Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd. However, no supporting document like Board Resolution or other POA has been submitted which gives power to Mr. Nitin Garg for the same. Kindly clarify	The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been provided by the bidder in the information submitted at page no. 94 of scanned pdf file. Kindly clarify	The details experience in proposed position is being enclosed	As the required information has been shown therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed	
4.	Point 1.6 of Qualification Information	The bidder has submitted an Agreement dated 01.04.2017 to take over the proprietorship business of M/s. Garg Construction Co. by Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd. at page no. 28 of scanned pdf file. As per point no. 3 of the Agreement, the party of the second part i.e, Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd shall satisfy the sale consideration within 12 months of this agreement by the issue of equity shares having face value of Rs. 10 each its book value to the proprietor Sh. Ashok Kumar Garg in lieu of the capital outstanding at close of his business on 31.03.2017 of the party of the first part i.e, M/s. Garg Construction Co.	The takeover is complete since the sale consideration stands paid through the equity shares capital issued by the Garg Son Estate Promoters Pvt Ltd. to the proprietors Sh. Ashok kumar Garg. The equity shares capital issued is the sale consideration well accepted by law of Land. Therefore the takeover is complete and experience is the terms of Technical capability as well as turnover of the First Party can be claimed by the Second Party. The Form MGT -14 duly filed to the MCA for intimation of takeover is also being enclosed.	The takeover has replied that it has submitted Form MGT -14 duly filed to the MCA for intimation of takeover, however no such supporting document is received, therefore, favourable experience of M/s. Garg Construction Co. is not considered for evaluation of Average Turnover, Similar Capacity and bid Capacity.	Agreed		
5.	Taking over Agreement	Based on the above said point it is inferred that					







	<p><i>the takeover will be complete only on satisfying the sale consideration by Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd by the issue of equity shares having face value of Rs. 10 each its book value to the proprietor Sh. Ashok Kumar Garg in lieu of the capital outstanding at close of his business on 31.03.2017 of M/s. Garg Construction Co. However, no further documents in respect of satisfying the above condition or consideration have been provided by the bidder.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, the bidder is required to clarify with supporting documents that how the experience of M/s. Garg Construction Co. could be claimed without satisfying the sale consideration as mentioned above.</i></p>		
6.	<p>4.2 (g) of ITB</p> <p><i>The Bank certificate for access to line of credit has been submitted at page no. 49 of scanned pdf file. However, the certificate given is "subject to available balance in their existing sanctioned limits with us". Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>The bank certificate issued from SBI Sector 17 Chandigarh where we are availing CC limits Since long time. This is issued on that basis. That's why the bank mention. "Subject to the available balance in their exiting sanction Limit with us".</p> <p>A new Bank Certificate is provided on the prescribed format given in RFP.</p>	<p>Since the correct certificate with Format as per RFP has been provided therefore, the same may be considered satisfactory.</p> <p>Agreed</p>

High

3/5. Murari Lal Agarwal:

S. No.	Appendix Reference/ Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	4.4 B (a)	<i>The Affidavit submitted by the bidder at page no. 203 of scanned pdf file is not exactly as per format of RFP. In 2nd point of Affidavit, the words "during last years" are written instead of "during last 5 years" which is required as per format of RFP.</i> Kindly clarify	Due to typing mistake in the Affidavit it was written as " during last years " instead of " during last 5 years ". However we are submitting herewith the new Affidavit in which we have written " during last 5 years ". This is for your kind perusal and further necessary action.	The bidder replied that the mismatch of format is due to typing error and also submitted the same with proper format. Therefore, the reply of the bidder is considered satisfactory.	Agreed









4/5. Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd.:

S. No.	Appendix Reference/ Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	E/TEC Comments
1.	DSC and POA	<i>The DSC is in name of Ravi Rungta and the POA is in favour of Pankaj Kumar Rungta. As per RFP, in case authorized signatory holding Power of Attorney and Digital Signatory are not the same, the bid shall be considered non-responsive. Kindly clarify</i>	Being there is two directors Having equal powers and shares is also empowered in case of either of signatory as per the AOA and MOA. Since power of attorney was sort by you and oneself could not provide POA to himself. Hence, POA provided by one director to the Director and the POA. Director was out of station. Hence DS certified Director Ravi Rungta submitted the e-tender.	The bidder replied that as the Attorney holder was out of station therefore other director has signed digitally. NHIDCL may decide whether to accept the same or not.	Not accepted as per RFP
2.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<i>The bidder has submitted a copy of educational degree of all technical key personnel's, however as per requirement of clause 4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid, the bidder should submit the detailed and signed CV's of the Key Technical Personnel's at S. No.1 (Project Manager) signed by the key personnel himself, must be uploaded along with the bid. The detailed CV has not been submitted. Kindly clarify</i>	We have submitted the list mentioning the work experience along with copy of degree certificates of key technical personals and the notarized affidavit duly signed by the concerned key technical key personals which itself state the CV's of each technical personal. However, once again we are herewith submitting the detailed signed CV of key technical personals at S.no. 1 of appendix to the Bid for your further clarification.	As the detailed CVs has now been shown, therefore, the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed
3.	Point 1.6 of Qualification	<i>The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been</i>	As mentioned in the S. No. 2 above a copy of degree	The details has also not been filled, however as the full CV	Agreed

h h

Signature

Signature

	Information	<i>provided by the bidder in the information submitted at page no. 9 of scanned pdf file.</i> Kindly clarify	certificates and notarized affidavits of key technical personnel itself clarifies point 1.6 of Qualification information. However, once again we are herewith submitting a separate detailed tabulated biographical data for technical personals.	has been provided therefore such details could be extracted and evaluation done accordingly.	
4.	Bank Guarantee	<i>Scan copy of BG for Rs. 5,84,000 is not submitted which is required as per point 16 of Section 2 (A) ITB. However, FDR of Rs. 584000 has been submitted.</i> Kindly clarify	We have already uploaded the scanned copy of the BG in the shape of FDR at the time of Bid submission. However if the same has gone for which the reason is unknown to us. Once again we are herewith submitting the scanned copies of BG in the form of FDR	The acceptance of FDR for Bid security may be decided by NHIDCL.	Agreed
5.	Financial Statement	<i>Five years Financial Statements (Audited Annual Reports) have not been found in the submitted bid which is required as per clause 4.2 (f) of Section 2 (A) ITB.</i> Kindly clarify	We have already uploaded the scanned copy of the Audited Annual Reports in the shape of annual turnover certificate for five years, at the time of Bid submission. However if the same has gone under process for which the reason is unknown to us. Once again we are herewith submitting the scanned copies.	Five year Audited Annual reports have been provided, therefore the reply has been considered satisfactory.	Agreed
6.	4.2 (g) of ITB	<i>The Bank certificate for access to line of credit has been submitted at page no. 17 of scanned pdf file. However, the statement says that Bank has already provided the working capital to the bidder instead of promising to provide the credit facilities for the concerned project if it is awarded.</i>	In the Andaman banks provide the lines to access to credit facility to whole govt. Projects to the concerned parties as per the feasibility criteria instead of every single project. Also, our firm has its inner line financial capacity of executing of this magnitude work and the same is	The bidder has not provided Bank Certificate in required format instead it has provided the bank certificate generally for all the government projects. Therefore, the statement given by the bank do not assure that in case the concerned work is awarded to	Agreed

Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink.

		<p>Kindly clarify</p>	<p>also justified from our audited balance sheet. However, if we feel at the time of any additional financial assistance then we will use this credit facility.</p>	<p>the bidder then the bank will be able to provide overdraft / credit facilities to the extent of Rs.(10% of contract value) to meet their working capital requirements for execution. Based on the above facts the bidder will be considered as Non Responsive as per clause 4.4 B (a) (iii)</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Clause 4.2 of ITB and Section III Qualification Information</p>	<p><i>As per Section III (Qualification Information), information as given under point 1.1 to 1.7 (like firm details, List of civil works executed, List of existing commitment, bid capacity details, List of equipment as required, litigation history etc.) is required to be provided which is not submitted by the bidder in the scanned documents given in pdf file. The same details are also required to be submitted as per clause 4.2 of Section 2 (A) ITB. Kindly clarify and provide the same exactly as per format of RFP.</i></p> <p><i>Further, the supporting documents as mentioned in point 1.4 (b) (i), 1.4 (b) (ii) is also required to be submitted. In case the supporting certificates for existing commitments and balance works are not found then the full value of the contract will be considered for calculation of bid capacity as per clause 4.6 of ITB.</i></p>	<p>All information as sort in the qualification information statement III has been individually submitted in the form of various certified copies like LOA, list of income as annual reports, Bid capacity details as in the form of our enlistment copy list of equipment, affidavit, etc. However, we are herewith submitting the tabulated details as per the performa specified in section III.</p>	<p>The details have now been submitted and considered. However, the supporting certificates for existing commitments has not been provided, therefore Value of b for calculation of Bid Capacity has been considered based on full value of the contract.</p> <p>Further, List of equipment is also not submitted as per requirement of RFP Format. However, as the undertaking regarding deployment of required equipment as mentioned in the Appendix to ITB has been provided by the bidder as per clause 4.4 B (b) (i) of RFP, therefore the same is considered satisfactory.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agreed</p>







5/5. Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.

S. No.	Appendix Reference/ Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	4.2 (a)	<i>In the POA submitted by the bidder, Mr. Surendra Kumar Prahladka has authorized Mr. Pankaj Prahladka as Authorized Signatory on behalf of Surendra Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. However, no supporting document like Board Resolution or other POA has been submitted which gives power to Mr. Surendra Kumar Prahladka for the same.</i> Kindly clarify <i>As per the referred clause the bidder is required to complete at least one contract of road i.e. State Highway, National Highway with similar or higher Bituminous work specification of at least 40% of value (Rs. 116.80 lakhs) of proposed Contract within the last five years. It is not clear that from which project (from the submitted document) such requirement is fulfilled.</i> Kindly clarify from which road i.e. State Highway, National Highway project, such requirement has been fulfilled.	<i>Mr. Surendra Kumar Prahladka is Managing Director of the Company. The Board Resolution and the Form 32 enclosed.</i>	As the Board resolution has now been shown therefore the reply of the bidder is considered as satisfactory.	Agreed
2.	4.4 (b) of ITB		Work experience certificate enclosed	The bidder has submitted extra projects which will not be considered. From the submitted projects of the bidder, the requirement of at least one contract of road i.e. State Highway, National Highway with similar or higher Bituminous work specification of at least 40% of value (Rs. 125.20 lakhs) of proposed Contract within the last five years. Has not been fulfilled.	Agreed
3.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<i>The bidder has not submitted a copy of educational degree of all technical key personnel's, however as per</i>	The technical Key Personnel's signed CV along with	As the information has been shown, the same has been considered satisfactory.	Agreed





	<p>requirement of clause 4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid, the bidder should submit the detailed and signed CVs of the Key Technical Personnel's at S. No.1 (Project Manager) signed by the key personnel himself which must be uploaded along with the bid and the name and educational qualification of other personnel should be given. The detailed CV and educational qualification certificates has not been submitted.</p>	<p>Educational Certificate and the list of other personnel attached.</p>	
4.	<p>Point 1.6 of Qualification Information</p> <p>Kindly clarify The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been provided by the bidder in the information submitted at page no. 11 of scanned pdf file.</p>	<p>As the information has been shown, the same has been considered satisfactory.</p>	Agreed
5.	<p>4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid</p> <p>Kindly clarify As per the referred clause, the details of Key Personnel Project Manager, Site Engineer and Quantity Surveyor are required to be submitted. However, the bidder has not submitted the information about which person is proposed as Project Manager and Quantity surveyor instead only the designation of the key personnel is submitted at page no. 11 of scanned pdf file.</p>	<p>The information has now been provided, therefore the same has been considered.</p>	Agreed
6.	<p>Clause 4.2 of ITB and</p> <p>Kindly clarify As per Section III (Qualification Information), information as given</p>	<p>List of work under Execution, list of work</p>	<p>The details have now been submitted and considered.</p> <p>Agreed</p>

Clear

SM

Day

[Handwritten signature]

	<p>Section III Qualification Information</p>	<p><i>under point 1.1 to 1.7 (like firm details, List of civil works executed, List of existing commitment, bid capacity details, List of equipment as required, litigation history etc.) is required to be provided which is not submitted by the bidder in the scanned documents given in pdf file. The same details are also required to be submitted as per clause 4.2 of Section 2 (A) ITB. Kindly clarify and provide the same exactly as per format of RFP. Further, the supporting documents as mentioned in point 1.4 (a), 1.4 (b) (i), 1.4 (b) (ii) is also required to be submitted. In case the supporting certificates for existing commitments and balance works are not found then the full value of the contract will be considered for calculation of bid capacity as per clause 4.6 of ITB.</i></p>	<p>completed and the list of equipments with valuer's report and Bid capacity enclosed.</p>	<p>However, the supporting certificates for existing commitments has not been provided, therefore Value of b for calculation of Bid Capacity has been considered based on full value of the contract. Further, 2 numbers of Water Tanker is required as per RFP and the bidder has only one number of Water Tanker as per List of equipment submitted. However, as the undertaking regarding deployment of required equipment as mentioned in the Appendix to ITB has been provided by the bidder as per clause 4.4 B (b) (i) of RFP, therefore the same is considered satisfactory</p>	
7.	4.2 (g) of ITB	<p><i>The Bank certificate for access to line of credit has not been submitted. However, a solvency certificate at page no. 17 has been submitted which is not as per required RFP format. Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>The bank certificate is enclosed as per format.</p>	<p>Information now received has been considered.</p>	Agreed
8.	Letter of Application	<p><i>Bidder has not submitted the letter of application which is required as per Section- IV of RFP. Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>The application is enclosed.</p>	<p>Application now received has been considered.</p>	Agreed
9.	PAN No.	<p><i>Bidder has not submitted the PAN No.</i></p>	<p>The copy of PAN card</p>	<p>Information about PAN No. now</p>	Agreed

✓

[Signature]

[Signature]

		<i>Proof which is required as per Section-III of RFP.</i>	enclosed.	received has been considered.	
10.	Financial Statement	Kindly clarify <i>Five years Financial Statements (Audited Annual Reports) have not been found in the submitted bid which is required as per clause 4.2 (f) of Section 2 (A) ITB.</i>	Five years audited balance sheet copies enclosed.	Information now received has been considered.	Agreed
11.	Clause 15.1 of ITB	Kindly clarify <i>The bidder has provided an undertaking for the validity of bid at page no. 23 of scanned pdf file. However, the days for which it is valid is not mentioned.</i>	The fresh undertakings for the validity of bid for 120 days enclosed.	Information now received has been considered.	Agreed
12.	Clause 4.4 B (b) (i) and Appendix 1.7	Kindly Clarify <i>The bidder has submitted its undertaking at page no. 24 of the scanned pdf file. However, the words "key requirements" are used instead of "key equipments" which are required as per the Format.</i>	The undertaking with the correction enclosed.	Information now received has been considered.	Agreed





