

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 2346 1600, www.nhidcl.com



BHARATMALA
ROAD TO PROSPERITY



NHIDCL
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - BUILDING THE NATION
CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062

सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का उपक्रम

A PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKING

NHIDCL/A&N/NH-4/Package-V/2018/

Date: - 07.01.2019

To,

All the Bidders

Sub: - Rehabilitation of Km 0.00 to Km 12.00 section in Andaman Trunk Road of NH-4 to Intermediate lane with hard shoulder in the Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Total Length 12.00 km) on EPC Mode (Package-V) - **Annulment of Bidding Process and re-invitation of Bids**

Ref: - Your Bid Submitted on 18.12.2018

Sir,

The bidding process for the subject work has been annulled due to receipt of only 1(one) responsive bid in the 1st call. The bid is being re-invited having bid due date as 23.01.2019.

Yours sincerely

(Y.C. Srivastava)
General Manager (T)

Enclosure: - 1. Minutes of meeting of ETEC dated 03.01.2019

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical Division)

Evaluation of Technical Bids for “Rehabilitation of Km 0.00 to Km 12.00 section in Andaman Trunk Road of NH-4 to Intermediate lane with hard shoulder in the Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Total Length 12.00 km) on EPC Mode (Package-V)”-Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) held on 07.01.2019 at NHIDCL, HQ.

The RFP for the subject work was invited with Bid Due Date as 18.12.2018 till 15:00 hrs. In all, three bids were received from the following bidders:

Name of Work	Name of Bidders
Rehabilitation of Km 0.00 to Km 12.00 section in Andaman Trunk Road of NH-4 to Intermediate lane with hard shoulder in the Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Total Length 12.00 km) on EPC Mode (Package-V)	M/s Dineshchandra R. Agrawal Infracon Pvt. Ltd.
	M/s LSR Logistics Pvt. Ltd.
	M/s Garg and Garg Co.

2. During the first ETEC meeting held on 24.12.2018, ETEC decided to seek clarifications from all the 3 (three) bidders mentioned in the above table.

3. Accordingly, letter seeking clarifications were sent to all three bidders vis-à-vis M/s LSR Logistics Private Limited; M/s Garg and Garg Co.; M/s Dineshchandra R. Agrawal Infracon Pvt. Ltd. vide NHIDCL letter dated 26.12.2018. In response, all the three bidders submitted their clarifications within stipulated time and the same were forwarded to the Financial Consultant M/s Almondz Global Securities Limited. Financial Consultant vide their letter no. AGSL/2018-19/Andaman & Nicobar Islands/02 dated 03.01.2019 has submitted their final report.

4. Queries wise reply of the bidder with consultant recommendation is detailed below in tabular form:

M/s LSR Logistics Private Limited

Sl. No.	Appendix/ Annex No.	Description of clarification sought	Reply by Bidder	Consultant reply	Recommendation of ETEC
1.	Appendix-I - Annex-IV - Details of Eligible Projects	i) Bidder has claimed project code A to E under category 3. However, it cannot be ascertained that how the projects are eligible project under category 3 as per Clause 2.2.2.5 of RFP. Bidder to clarify how the projects are eligible projects under category 3 as per clause 2.2.2.5 of	i) Most of our works here been carried out on either National Highways or State Highways or MDRs as per Clause 2.2.2.6(ii). We are attaching documentary evidence of the same. Appendix i a-c (3) pages. ii) We hereby inform you that we received	Bidder has clarified that the projects has been carried out on either National Highways or State Highways or MDRs as per Clause 2.2.2.6(ii). Also, they have attached documentary evidence for the same. Bidder has claimed the works which includes providing, laying and compaction of thick dense	ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.

[Handwritten signatures in blue ink]





Sl. No.	Appendix/ Annex No.	Description of clarification sought	Reply by Bidder	Consultant reply	Recommendation of ETEC
		<p>RFP, by way of furnishing substantial documentation/proof.</p> <p>i) Bidder to clarify as to how the bidder is meeting the technical capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr. as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i).</p> <p>ii) Bidder to clarify as to how the bidder is meeting the eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>payments for road construction works executed by us during the last five financial years to the tune of Rs. 39.09 crore from various task Forces of BRO i.e. 759 BRTF, 38BRTF and 35BRTF. We are attaching certificates of the payments received by us as documentary proof.</p> <p>Appendix ii a-e(6) pages.</p> <p>iii) We have completed a single road construction work of Rs. 16.58 crore which is more than the required eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2(ii). We have already mentioned and attached this certificate in our technical bid and are also resubmitting it. Appendix iii(1) page</p>	<p>bituminous macadam and thick asphalt concrete. The matter was discussed with Authority and it decided that projects having project code A to D can be considered, as the same related to improvement works and are eligible project as per clause 2.2.2.5 of RFP. However, project having Project code E cannot be considered, as it is not an eligible project as per clause 2.2.2.5 of RFP</p> <p>In project code C, Bidder has not received any amount in the last five financial year i.e. FY 2013-14 to 2017-18. Hence, the same cannot be considered.</p> <p>In project code D, Bidder has received Rs. 1.57 Crore only during the last five financial year i.e. FY 2013-14 to 2017-18, which is less than 10% of the EPC (i.e. Rs. 2.33 Crore), as per the requirement of Clause 2.2.2.6(ii) of RFP. Hence, the same cannot be considered.</p> <p>On the basis of the aforementioned, projects with project code A and B only were considered as eligible projects for calculation of the Technical Threshold Criteria.</p> <p>(i). On the basis of the (i) above, Bidder is not meeting the requisite Technical Capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr., as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP.</p> <p>(ii). As per RFP works related to Improvement in Riding Quality work cannot be considered for single</p>	

Sl. No.	Appendix/ Annex No.	Description of clarification sought	Reply by Bidder	Consultant reply	Recommendation of ETEC
				<p>completed work under Clause 2.2.2.2(ii) of RFP. Hence, no project of the Bidder can be considered as eligible project as per clause 2.2.2.5 of RFP</p> <p>Accordingly, on the basis of the aforementioned, the bidder is neither meeting the requisite Technical Capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr., as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP nor it is meeting eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p> <p>Outcome: Bidder is neither meeting the requisite Technical Capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr., as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP nor it is meeting eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p>	
2.	Appendix-I - Annex-VI- Bid Capacity	Information provided in Annex VI i.e. "To calculate value of "A" and "C" and "To calculate value of "B", have not been certified by the Statutory Auditor. Bidder to clarify.	Now we have attached the Annex VI i.e. to calculate value of "A" and "C" and "To calculate value of "B" which have been certified by the statutory auditor. Document enclosed here. Appended v a-c(3) Pages	Bidder has now furnished revised certificate certified by its Statutory Auditor. In view of the clarification received same may be considered. Outcome: May be considered.	ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.
3.	Appendix-II - Bank Guarantee for Bid security	Bidder has submitted Bank Guarantee for Bid security having validity upto 14th June 2019 , which is less than 180 days i.e. 16th June 2019 from Bid due date as per clause 2.20.1. Bidder to clarify.	We have executed our bank guarantee from 14 th June 2019 to up-to 14 th July 2019. We have also attached amendment of the bank. Appended v a-c (3) Pages	Bidder has furnished amendment to Bank Guarantee for extension of Bank Guarantee till July 14, 2019. In view of the clarification received, same may be considered. Outcome: May be considered.	ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.

K. an P. J. G. S. D.

M/s Garg & Garg Co.

1.	Appendix-IA- Letter comprising the Technical Bid	<p>i) Point no. 7(a) - 1st line - words "have to Reservation" have been mentioned instead of "have no reservation".</p> <p>ii) Point no. 7(d) - 1st line - words "ensure the tin conformity" have been mentioned instead of "ensure that in conformity".</p> <p>Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>Now we updated Appendix 1A Letter comprising the Technical Bid is attach here. (Annex-Attached)</p>	<p>Bidder has furnished updated Appendix 1A -Letter comprising the Technical bid.</p> <p>Since, it is a fresh submission, it cannot be considered. However, going by the intent of the Bidder to rectify the same, Authority may consider the same. Outcome: Authority may consider the same.</p>	<p>ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.</p>
2.	Appendix-I - Annex-I - Details of Bidder	<p>i) Bidder has not furnished replies pursuant to point no. 6 and 7.</p> <p>ii) Second last para i. e. "A statement by the w.r.t para 2.1.14" is missing.</p> <p>iii) Information required in the last table has not been furnished by the Bidder.</p> <p>iv) Last para i.e. "I/We certifyw.r.t a Non-Performing entity" is missing. Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>Now we update our documents Appendix-I - Annex-I - Details of Bidder Attached document here.</p>	<p>Bidder has furnished updated Appendix-1A of Annex I- Detail of Bidder.</p> <p>In view of the clarification received, same may be considered.</p> <p>Outcome: May be considered.</p>	<p>ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.</p>
3.	Appendix-I - Annex-III - Financial Capacity of the Bidder	<p>i) Bidder has not furnished its Bank Account details.</p> <p>ii) Bidder has not furnished complete Financial Statements along with notes for the last 5 years. i.e. for the FY 2013-14 to FY 2017-18.</p> <p>iii) Bidder has not provided an Auditor's certificate specifying</p>	<p>Now we are attaching the all the documents of Appendix-I - Annex-III - Financial Capacity of the Bidder.</p>	<p>i) Bidder has now furnished its Bank Account details.</p> <p>Outcome: May be considered.</p> <p>ii) Bidder has not furnished complete Financial Statements along with notes for the last 5 years. Hence, in the absence of the Financial Statements, Net Worth of the Bidder cannot be calculated.</p> <p>Outcome: In the absence of the Financial Statements, Net Worth of the Bidder</p>	<p>ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.</p>

kr   Bansal  

		<p>to how the bidder is meeting the technical capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr. as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i).</p> <p>iv) Bidder to clarify as to how the bidder is meeting the eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>work of Rs. 40.62 crore which is more than the required eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2(ii). We have already mentioned and attached this certificate in our technical bid and are also resubmitting it. Appendix iii (1) page</p>	<p>Technical Capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr., as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP nor meeting the eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p> <p>Outcome: Bidder is neither meeting the requisite Technical Capacity i.e. Rs. 23.30 Cr., as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP nor meeting the eligibility criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of one similar work of 25% of Estimated Project Cost i.e. 5.83 Cr.</p>	
5.	Appendix-I - Annex-VI- Bid Capacity	<p>i) Information provided in Annex VI i.e. "To calculate value of "A" and "C"" and "To calculate value of "B", have not been certified by the Statutory Auditor.</p> <p>ii) Bidder has not furnished supporting certificates/ documents for the calculation of the Bid Capacity.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>Now we have attached the Annex VI i.e. to calculate value of "A" and "C"" and "To calculate value of "B" which have been certified by the statutory auditor. Document enclosed here.</p> <p>Appended iv a-b(2) Pages</p>	<p>i) & ii) Bidder has furnished revised Annex VI i.e. to calculate value of "A" and "C" duly certified by Statutory Auditor. However, format for calculation of value of "B" is neither certified by Statutory Auditor & is nor in the format as per RFP. Additionally, bidder has also not furnished supporting certificates /documents for the calculation of the Bid Capacity.</p> <p>Outcome: Bidder has not submitted requisite documents</p>	ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.
6.	Appendix-II - Bank Guarantee for Bid security	<p>Bidder has submitted Bank Guarantee for Bid security having validity upto 13th May 2019, which is less than 180 days i.e. 16th June 2019, from Bid due date as per clause 2.20.1.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify.</p>	<p>We hereby undertaking that we will extend our bank guarantee if the tender is allotted to our firm undertaking letter is attached here.</p> <p>Appended v a-c (3) Pages.</p>	<p>Bidder has replied that bidder will extend bank guarantee if tender is allotted to the bidder.</p> <p>Hence, Bidder has not provided amendment to the Bank Guarantee. Accordingly, Authority may take a view on the same.</p> <p>Outcome: Authority may take a view.</p>	ETEC agreed with the recommendation of consultant.
M/s Dineshchandra R. Agrawal Infracon Pvt. Ltd.					
1.	Appendix-I -	In Annex-II -	It was merely a	Bidder has clarified that	ETEC agreed

Annex-I Details of Bidder	- of	Technical capacity of the Bidder, the bidder has claimed the projects under project code - b, c, e, f, & h under category 3, however in Annex - IV, bidder has mentioned the category of the same project codes as category 4. Bidder to clarify.	typographical error. Hence we request you to consider project code- b, c, e, f, & h under category 3, in Annex IV.	the category of the project code - b, c, e, f, & h were mentioned as 4 due to typographical error. Bidder has also requested to consider the above mentioned projects under Category 3. In the view of clarification received same may be considered. Outcome: May be considered.	with the recommendation of consultant.
------------------------------------	---------	---	--	--	--

5. Committee deliberated in detail upon the clarifications received and recommendation of financial consultant and observed that only 1 (one) bidder i.e. M/s Dineshchandra R. Agrawal Infracon Pvt. Ltd. is fulfilling the RFP criteria of responsiveness and hence declared **technically responsive** and remaining 2 (two) bidders i.e. M/s LSR Logistics Private Limited & M/s Garg and Garg Co. are not meeting the minimum **eligibility criteria of Technical Threshold Capacity which is required as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of the RFP**, hence declared **non-responsive**. As only 1 (one) bidder has qualified for financial opening, ETEC recommended for annulment of bidder process and to re-invite the bids after seeking approval of the Competent Authority.

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder/JV	Responsive status for Financial Opening
1.	M/s Dineshchandra R. Agrawal Infracon Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive
2.	M/s LSR Logistics Pvt. Ltd.	Non-responsive
3.	M/s Garg and Garg Co.	Non-responsive

6. Meeting ended with Vote of thanks to Chair.


V K Singh
(ED-IV)
Chairman


Y. C. Srivastava
(GM-Tech)
Member Secretary


A. K. Gupta
(GM-Tech)
Member


V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member


Uttam Chatterjee
DGM (Finance)
Member