

Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) for evaluating Technical Bids for "Routine Maintenance of Middle Strait to Rangat from Km 107.00 to Km 220.00 (Length = 113 Km) of NH-4 (old NH-223) (Maintenance Package-II) 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 Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company & 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 Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company 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 been forwarded to M/s. KRA & Co. Chartered Accountants. Details of reply submitted by bidders alongwith comments of committee 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 the bidding capacity more than the total estimated cost of the Works. i.e. Rs. 369 Lakh	At least one completed work similar nature during last 5 Years (Rs. Lakh) In Rs.147.60 Lakh (40%)	Achieved an average annual financial turnover equal to the amount Rs. 147.60 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.	Murarilal Agarwal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Responsive

Handwritten signature/initials

Handwritten signature/initials

Handwritten signature/initials

Handwritten signature/initials

4.	Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non Responsive
5.	M/s Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Non Responsive

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

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. 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 M/s 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> <p>Based on the clarification sought, M/s Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company is not qualified for Financial opening because Bidder</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has not achieved 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. 147.60 lakhs) of proposed Contract within the last five years (as per clause 4.4 A (b) , The bid of the bidder is Non Responsive in terms of clause 12.2 (d) and clause 4.4 B (a) (iii) of RFP. <p>1. Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd., 2. Garg Sons Estate Promoters Pvt. Ltd. 3. Murari Lal Agarwal, and</p> <p>are qualified for Financial Opening.</p>
3	Non Responsive Bidders (M/s Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company)	1	
4	Eligible for financial opening	3	









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 Prasur Electricals and Engineering Company** 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



Adil Singh
GM (T): Member



(Utam Chatterjee)
DGM (Finance):
Member



Col. Rajeev Sood
GM(T): Member Secretary



Vivekanand Jaiswal
DGM (T): Member

CLARIFICATION SOUGHT, REPLY RECEIVED AND EVALUATED

I/S. Baba Projects Pvt. Ltd.:

ETEC Comments	KRA Remarks	Reply	Observation	Appendix / Clause reference	S. No.
Agreed	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.	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.	<i>Kindly clarify</i> 10.05.2017 on the stamp paper which was scanned pdf file. The POA has been executed on 16.05.2017 instead of 10.05.2017.	4.2 (a)	1.
Agreed	The bidder has now accepted the exact format of Affidavit as mentioned in RFP. Therefore the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.	A fresh copy of Affidavit in stamp paper duly notarized is being attached.	<i>Kindly clarify</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.	4.4 B (a)	1.

(Handwritten signatures and initials)

<p>The bidder has now Agreed</p>	<p>The bidder has now Agreed as required; therefore the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.</p>	<p>Earlier we have submitted Affidavit & Education Certificates of Technical Person. The detailed CV along with the Signature of Personnel has been attached with the letter for your kind reference.</p>	<p>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 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. <i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid</p>	<p>2.</p>
<p>Agreed</p>	<p>As the details have been provided, therefore the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.</p>	<p>A fresh copy of 1.6 with details of proposed position is attached for your reference.</p>	<p>The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been provided by the bidder in scanned pdf file. <i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>Point 1.6 of Information</p>	<p>3.</p>
<p>Agreed</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>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 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 No. 087GT02171350003" are written which are extra from format of RFP. <i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>Bank Guarantee</p>	<p>4.</p>

OK

[Signature]

[Signature]





[Signature]

S. No.	Appendix / Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	Bank Guarantee	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. <i>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).	The extension of the bank guarantee has been shown. Therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed
2.	Bank Guarantee	In the Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder, a Non transferrable of beneficiary has also been added in the submitted BG. <i>Kindly clarify and provide the amendment for the same.</i>	These clauses in bank guarantee as obtained from the bank in regard is per bank norm and practice the letter being enclosed herewith.	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 Bid	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. <i>Kindly clarify</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.	The experience has been counted from the month of examination held at the Site Engineer Mr. Sameer Mehta for required experience	Agreed
2.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Bid	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	This CV of Mr. Subash Chandra Singh (Project manager) already uploaded along with bid. The details	The submitted CV of Project manager has been accepted as	Agreed

			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.		
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	As the Board resolution has been shown therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed	
4.	Point 1.6 of Qualification Information	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	As the required information has been shown therefore, reply given by the bidder is satisfactory.	Agreed	
5.	Taking over Agreement	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. Based on the above said point it is inferred that the	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 considered for evaluation of	Agreed	The bidder 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.		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		6.
Agreed	Since the correct certificate with RFP format as per RFP has been provided therefore, the same may be considered satisfactory.	<p>The bank certificate issued from SBI Sector 17 Chandigarh where we are availing CC limits Since long time. 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>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".</p> <p>Kindly clarify</p>	4.2 (g) of ITB	7.
Agreed	Since the correct certificate has been provided therefore, the same may be considered satisfactory.	The required certificate has been submitted	<p>The format for the undertaking required that the bidder should invest the minimum cash upto 25% of the value of work which is Rs. 92.25 Lacs (i.e. Rs.369 Lacs X 25%). However, the bidder has submitted an undertaking that it would invest cash upto Rs. 90.00 Lacs during implementation of the concerned contract (which is less than as required for the concerned contract).</p> <p>Kindly clarify</p>	4.2 (h)	

S. No.	Appendix Reference/ Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	4.4 B (a)	<p>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.</p> <p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>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 same with proper format. Therefore, the reply of the bidder is considered satisfactory.</p> <p>This is for your kind perusal and further necessary action.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Agreed

S. No.	Appendix Reference/ Clause reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	DSC and POA	<p>The DSC is in name of Ravi Rungta and the POA is in favour of Pankaj Kumar Rungta. As per RFP, in case of authorized signatory holding Power of Attorney and Digital Signatory are not the same, the bid shall be considered non-responsive.</p> <p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>Being there is two directors Having equal powers and shares is also empowered in case of 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Not accepted as per RFP
2.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Appendix to Bid	<p>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 CVs 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.</p> <p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>We have submitted the list mentioning the work experience along with copy of degree certificates of key technical persons and the notarized affidavit duly signed by the concerned key technical key persons 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.</p>	<p>As the detailed CVs has now been shown, therefore, the reply of the bidder is satisfactory.</p>	Agreed
3.	Point 1.6 of Qualification	<p>The details of Experience in the proposed position have not been</p>	<p>As mentioned in the S. No. 2 above a copy of degree</p>	<p>The details has also not been filled, however as the full CV</p>	Agreed

	<p>has been provided therefore such details could be extracted and evaluation done accordingly.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p> <p>information submitted at page no: 9 of scanned pdf file.</p>	<p>Information</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The acceptance of FDR for Bid security may be decided by NHIDCL.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p> <p>Scan copy of BG for Rs. 6,26,000 is not submitted which is required as per point 16 of Section 2 (A) ITB. However, FDR of Rs. 626000 has been submitted.</p>	<p>Bank Guarantee</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Five year Audited Annual reports have been provided, therefore the reply has been considered satisfactory.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Financial Statement</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The bidder has not provided Bank Certificate in required format instead it has provided for all the government projects. Therefore, the statement given by the bank do not assure that in case the</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>4.2 (g) of ITB</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>6.</p>
--	---	--	--	---------------------------	---------------	---	---	--	------------------------------	---------------	---	---	---	-----------------------------------	---------------	---	--	---	------------------------------	---------------	-----------

Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink at the top of the page.

<p>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. <i>Based on the above facts the bidder will be considered as Non Responsive as per clause 4.4 B (a) (iii)</i></p>	<p>The details have now been submitted and considered. However, the supporting certificates for existing commitments has not been provided, therefore Value of Bid for calculation of Capacity has been considered based on full value of the contract. 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) (1) of RFP, therefore the same is considered satisfactory.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>magnitude work and the same is 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>All information as sort in the 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>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) (1) of RFP, therefore the same is considered satisfactory.</p>
<p>it is awarded.</p> <p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>As per Section III (Qualification 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Clause 4.2 of ITB and Section III Qualification Information</p>	<p>Information</p>

Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink at the top of the page.

S. No.	Appendix Reference/Clause Reference	Observation	Reply	KRA Remarks	ETEC Comments
1.	4.4 (b) of ITB	As per the referred clause the bidder is required to complete at least one contract of road i.e. State Highway, National Highway, National Highway with similar or higher Bituminous work specification of at least 40% of value (Rs. 147.60 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. Kindly clarify from which road i.e. State Highway, National Highway project, such requirement has been fulfilled.	The experience Certificate enclosed is situated at inside MES Panagarh Camp.	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. 147.60 lakhs) of proposed Contract within the last five years. Has not been fulfilled.	Agreed
2.	4.2 (a) of ITB	As per the referred clause, a power of attorney to commit the signatory of the bid for the concerned project is required to be submitted, however no such power of attorney is submitted instead the Partnership Deed has been submitted which is general and not for the concerned project.	Mr. Pradip Kumar Prahladka is Managing Partner of the Company, no need the power of Attorney.	The project specific POA has not been submitted which is required as per clause 4.2 (a) of ITB. Therefore, the Bid is considered as Non Responsive as per clause 12.2 (d).	Agreed
3.	4.4B (b)(ii) of Bid Appendix to	The bidder has not 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 CVs of the Key Technical Personnel's at S. No.1 (Project Manager) signed by the key personnel himself which	The technical Key Personnel's signed CV along with Educational Certificate and the list of other personnel attached.	As the information has been shown, the same has been considered satisfactory.	Agreed

4.	Point 1.6 of Qualification Information	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. 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. Kindly clarify	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 equipment as required, 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.	List of work under Execution, list of work completed and the list of equipments with valuer's report and Bid capacity enclosed.
5.	4.4B (b)(iii) of Bid				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. Further, List of equipment is also not submitted as per requirement of
6.	Clause 4.2 of ITB and Section III Qualification Information				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. Further, List of equipment is also not submitted as per requirement of

11.	Clause 15.1 of ITB	<p>The bidder has provided an undertaking for the validity of bid at page no. 27 of scanned pdf file. However, the days for which it is valid is not mentioned.</p> <p><i>Kindly Clarify</i></p>	<p>The fresh undertakings for the validity of bid for 120 days enclosed.</p>	<p>Information now received has been considered.</p> <p>Agreed</p>
12.	Clause 4.4 B (b) (i) and Appendix 1.7	<p>The bidder has submitted its undertaking at page no. 28 of the scanned pdf file. However, the words "key equipments" are used instead of "key equipments" which are required as per the Format.</p> <p><i>Kindly clarify</i></p>	<p>The undertaking with the correction enclosed.</p>	<p>Information now received has been considered</p> <p>Agreed</p>

