

राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग एवं अवसंरचना विकास निगम लिमिटेड

सड़क परिवहन और राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार
तीसरी मंजिल, पीटीआई बिल्डिंग, 4-संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Govt. of India
3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4-Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001. +91 11 23461600, www.nhidcl.com



BHARATMALA
ROAD TO PROSPERITY



CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062

(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

(A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/Nagaland/Kohima Bypass /Pkg IV/ 2019

29.07.2020

To

All the Technically Qualified Bidders (Listed below)

Sub: Construction of two lane with paved shoulder of Kohima-Bypass Road connecting NH-39 (New NH-02), NH-150(New NH-02), NH-61(New NH-29) and NH-39 (New NH-02) from Design Km 32.00 to design Km 43.454 [Design Length - 11.454 Km] in the state of Nagaland Under SARDP-NE on EPC Mode (Package IV) - *Opening of Financial Bid - reg.*

Based on the Technical Evaluation, following firms are found technically qualified for the subject project:

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s Narendra Sharma	Technically Responsive
2	M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV)	Technically Responsive
3	M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons	Technically Responsive
4	M/s Pele Khezhie	Technically Responsive

2. A copy of the Minutes of Meeting of the Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) is also enclosed herewith for information of applicant bidders.

3. Authority will open the online Financial Proposal on **03.08.2020 at 11:00 PM** in the presence of the authorized representatives of the Bidders who may choose to attend at NHIDCL, HQ, 3rd Floor, PTI Building, 4 Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001

Encl: As above.


(A. K. Jha)

General Manager (Technical)

Email: gmnagaland.nhidcl@gmail.com

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

Minutes of Meetings of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) for "Construction of two lane with paved shoulder of Kohima-Bypass Road connecting NH-39 (New NH-02), NH-150(New NH-02), NH-61(New NH-29) and NH-39 (New NH-02) from Design Km 32.00 to design Km 43.454 [Design Length - 11.454 Km] in the state of Nagaland Under SARDP-NE on EPC Mode (Package IV)" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi on 28.07.2020

1. The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 08.07.2020 at 1100 hrs.

2. Empowered Technical Bid Opening Committee (ETBC) met to open the technical Bids on 09.07.2020 at 1100 hrs. The following bidders have submitted their bids online.

- (i) M/s Credible Engineering Construction Projects Limited - Rockeira Engineering LLP (JV)
- (ii) M/s Narendra Sharma
- (iii) M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV)
- (iv) M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons.
- (v) M/s Pele Khezhe

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of Rs 143.71 Crore.

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	143.71
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	71.86
3	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	43.11
4	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	14.37
5	Minimum required amount of COMPLETED Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 from at least one similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii)	21.56
6	For a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 , the Capital Cost of the project should be more than (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (c))	14.371
7	Minimum required amount of self constructed project by the Bidder for a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 1&2 (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d))	one half of the Project Cost of eligible projects as defined in clause 2.2.2.6 (i) (d).
8	For a project to qualify as a Eligible Project under Category 3&4 , the receipt / payments of the project should be more than (as per clause 2.2.2.6 (ii))	14.371
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	7.19
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	4.31
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.44
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	28.74
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	17.25
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	5.75
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	71.855
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	43.113
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	14.371

4. The Evaluation Committee in its first ETEC during evaluation found that some of the data/information provided by the Bidders are not adhering to the clauses given in the RFP document, so it was proposed that the









Page 1 of 7

clarification may be sought from the Bidders as per clause no 3.1.4 of the RFP to facilitate the evaluation process. Accordingly, the Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) in its 1st meeting held on 17.07.2020 has decided that the clarification as requested by the Technical Division is to be sought from the respective bidders.

5. In Continuation to 1st Meeting of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) held on 17.07.2020, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the ETEC in 2nd meeting held on 28.07.2020. The Committee observed that most of the bidders have submitted the financial capacity such as turnover and Net worth of FY 2018-19, FY 2017-18, FY 2016-17, FY 2015-16 & FY 2014-15 and not submitted the undertaking as per clause 2.2.2.8(ii). Accordingly, the Committee considered the financial account of FY 2018-19 to 2015-16 for such bidders who have not submitted the Audited Financial account of 2019-20. The remarks of ETEC w.r.t the observations and reply received are tabulated below:

S.No	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought	Reply received from the bidder	Comments of the Committee
1	M/s Credible Engineering Construction Projects Limited - Rockeira Engineering LLP (JV)	Kindly refer the work of Construction of Important Bridge across River Gowthmi with RCC Column substructure, As per RFP Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii), the span of bridge is required to be indicated, hence the same needs to be clarified by the bidder. Further it is also requested to clarify whether the full bridge including foundation, substructure and super structure has been constructed for highway projects or otherwise. Further as per clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) v, the bridge of railway line is to be considered under category 4, whereas same has been claimed in category 3. Please clarify.	The span as per certificate is 76.2 mtrs. The Bridge covering foundation and substructure completed. Super structure to be completed. As we thought this bridge certificate for span purpose, we did not mention the other one, which is attached here with for your consideration. In hurry, the work was claimed in Category -3. Request you to consider under Category - 4.	The work of "Construction of Important Bridge across River Gowthmi with RCC Column substructure" is a railway bridge. Thus as per clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) v, the bridge of railway line is to be considered under category 4. However, as per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) "If any Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover/Tunnel is (are) part of the project, then the sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 5 (Five) years preceding the Bid Due Date (works completed as on bid due date shall also be considered for this clause) i.e. shall have completed atleast one similar Bridge/ROB/Flyover having span equal to or greater than 50% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project" As the contractor has clearly stated in the certificate that only the Foundation and Substructure work has been completed while the Superstructure has not been completed. Thus, the full bridge has not been completed by the Contractor. Further the bridge constructed by bidder is

Ajay A

MS

gh

of

Page 2 of 7

				<p>Railway Bridge, which cannot be considered for additional experience of Major Bridge on road Projects.</p> <p>Further, an email was sent to the Contractor asking to submit the Appendix X and XI as per the prescribed format of RFP for net worth and Turnover. The same was submitted by the Contractor on 25.07.2020.</p> <p>Since the bidder does not qualify the requisite qualification of additional experience of similar work, hence the committee decided to treat the bidder as technically non-responsive</p>
2	M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons	<p>In regards to one similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2, the details of similar bridge experience cannot be found in the online submitted document.</p> <p>It is requested to provide reference of eligible work wherein the similar Bridge has been taken. Further it is requested to provide the certificate from the issuing Authority clearly stating the span of similar bridge completed in the last 5 financial year as per RFP 2.2.2.2 (ii) in similar work i.e. highway project.</p>	<p>“With reference to the subject, I am submitting herewith the necessary /documents in support of the tender. Therefore kindly look into the matter and take necessary action.”</p> <p>Name of work: Up-gradation of Viswema - Kidima - Zuketsa - Tadubi road to MDR under NER 11th Plan Scheme.</p>	<p>The contractor has submitted the details of 2 bridges of Single Span of 18 m and 20 m on MDR road.</p> <p>As per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii), <i>“If any Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover/Tunnel is (are) part of the project, then the sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 5 (Five) years preceding the Bid Due Date (works completed as on bid due date shall also be considered for this clause) i.e. shall have completed atleast one similar Bridge/ROB/Flyover having span equal to or greater than 50% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project”</i></p> <p>As per Corrigendum 2, RFP Section-7, Data sheet “Longest Span of Major Bridge/ ROB /Flyover to be constructed : 30 m”</p> <p>Further, an email was sent to the Contractor asking to submit the Appendix X and XI as per the prescribed format</p>

Ajay A

[Signature]

[Signature]

Page 3 of 7

				<p>of RFP for net worth and Turnover. The same was submitted by the Contractor on 27.07.2020</p> <p>Contractor has completed Bridge of single span of 20 m as per the requirement of RFP which is 15m.</p> <p>Since the bidder qualifies the requisite qualification of additional experience of similar work, hence the committee decided to treat the bidder as technically responsive.</p>
3	M/s Narendra Sharma	<p>In regards to eligible projects, the details of major bridge experience cannot be found in the online submitted document.</p> <p>It is requested to provide reference of eligible projects wherein the similar Bridge has been taken. Further it is requested to provide the certificate from issuing Authority clearly stating the span of similar bridge completed in the last 5 financial years as per RFP 2.2.2.2 (ii).</p> <p>Further, it is requested to provide the statutory auditor's certificate along with the proper UDIN Number as the same is missing in all the documents.</p>	<p>In reference to your letter subject above, following documents are submitted as required by you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work Completion Certificate with detail of Bridge work. 2. CA certificates with UDIN Number, 	<p>The Contractor has submitted the certificate of additional work of Bridge for the work of "Construction of road from Babai bagra Nasirabad upto Narmada Bridge road length 25.90 Km (MDR - 30)" which is MDR work.</p> <p>As per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (ii), "If any Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover/Tunnel is (are) part of the project, then the sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 5 (Five) years preceding the Bid Due Date (works completed as on bid due date shall also be considered for this clause) i.e. shall have completed atleast one similar Bridge/ROB/Flyover having span equal to or greater than 50% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project"</p> <p>The bidder was asked to submit the details of span of bridge. In response, the GAD was sent by the bidder of the span of 18 m.</p> <p>Contractor has completed Bridge of single span of 18 m as per the requirement of RFP which is 15m.</p> <p>Since the bidder qualifies the requisite qualification of</p>

Ajay

M

Agh

2

				additional experience of similar work, hence the committee decided to treat the bidder as technically responsive.
--	--	--	--	---

6. Further, the other two bidders M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV) & M/s Pele Khezhi has the requisite certificates of similar work and additional work of Bridge as per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (iii).

7. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the above bidders as per the report are as Annexure -I.

8. The Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) in its 2nd meeting has discussed the evaluation carried out by the Financial Consultant and after deliberation status of evaluation is as below.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status	No. of Projects held with NHIDCL
1	M/s Credible Engineering Construction Projects Limited - Rockeira Engineering LLP (JV)	Technically Non - Responsive	0
2	M/s Narendra Sharma	Technically Responsive	0
3	M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV)	Technically Responsive	1
4	M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons	Technically Responsive	0
5	M/s Pele Khezhi	Technically Responsive	0

9. The Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 4 technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair


Ajay Ahulwalia
(ED-I)
Chairman


A. K. Singh
(GM-Tech)
Member


A.K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member


Mahesh Gupta
DGM -Fin.
Member

Annexure - I

Summary of Technical Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs. 71.86 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause-2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 21.56 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 43.11 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 14.37 Cr.	Additional Experience in Major Bridge for a span of 15 m
1.	M/s Credible Engineering Construction Projects Limited - Rockeira Engineering LLP (JV)	NA	Yes (Rs 171.00 Cr)	263.49	80.80	No
2.	M/s Pele Khenzie	115.31	Yes (Rs 33.22 Cr)	NA	NA	Yes
3.	M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV)	NA	Yes (Rs 25.78 Cr)	367.16	103.01	Yes
4.	M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons	278.13	Yes (Rs 77.40 Cr)	NA	NA	No
5.	M/s Narendra Sharma	83.44	Yes (38.83 Cr)	NA	NA	No

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR Crores)	Turnover (in INR Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1.	M/s Credible Engineering Construction Projects Limited - Rockeira Engineering LLP (JV)	JV	80-20	Lead - 47.98 Other - 22.16	Lead - 107.04 Other - 37.50	Y
2.	M/s Pele Khezhie	SE	-	53.54	68.16	Y
3.	M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd - Shree Manglam Buildcon Pvt Ltd (JV)	JV	70-30	Lead - 28.16 Other - 23.10	Lead - 84.00 Other - 80.99	Y
4.	M/s Vilelie Khamo & Sons	SE	-	266.32	142.07	Y
5.	M/s Narendra Sharma	SE	-	9.87	84.18	Y

Ajayra

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment

Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 71.86 Crore

Sr. No.	Name of the Applicant	Calculated/ Assessed							Claimed	Whether Qualifying or Not
		Financial / Calendar Year for which "A" has been claimed	Updation factor	Annual Turnover (Rs. Cr.)	A (Annual Turnover x Updation factor) Rs. Cr.	N	B (Rs. Cr.)	A x N x 2.5 - B (Rs. Cr.)	A (Annual Turnover x Updation factor) Rs. Cr.	
1	Pele Khezhe	2017	1.05	85.68	89.96	1.50	32.71	304.66		Yes
2	Narendra Sharma	2016	1.10	155.21	170.73	1.50	0.11	640.13		Yes
3	Vilielie Khamo	2015	1.15	176.54	203.02	1.50	252.20	509.12		Yes
4	Credible - Rockeira (JV)									
	Credible Engineering	2016	1.10	138.95	152.85	1.50	138.79	434.37		Yes
	Rockeira Enginnering LLP	2018	1.00	83.85	83.85	1.50	176.35	138.08		Yes
				Total				572.45	Total	Yes
5	KKB - Shree Manglam									
	KKB	2018	1.00	142.62	142.62	1.50	309.24	225.58		Yes
	Shree Manglam	2018	1.00	127.04	127.04	1.50	0.00	476.40		Yes

