

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical division)

Minutes of Meeting

Empowered Technical Evaluation Committee (ETEC) met for “Rehabilitation of existing churachandpur- singhat - Tuivai road on NH- 102B between Km 0.000 to Km 34.5 (Length 34.50 Km) in the state of Manipur on EPC Basis (2nd call)” on 15.03.2017, at NHIDCL, New Delhi- **Technical Evaluation-reg.**

The RFPs for the subject work were invited with bid due date as **02.03.2017** till **1700 hrs.**

2. The committee ETBC met to open technical Bids on **03.03.2017** at **1730 hrs** in the presence of applicant’s representatives who choose to attend and handed over the hard copy of the original documents along with the soft copy (as downloaded from E-bidding service portal viz. <https://eprocure.gov.in>) to the Financial Consultant of **M/s. Raj Har Gopal & Co.**

3. The following firms were recommended for technical evaluation:

- (i) **M/s Bhartiya Infra Projects Ltd**
- (ii) **M/s L.K. And SONS**
- (iii) **M/s KKB Projects Pvt Ltd**
- (iv) **M/s SERYYO HUNGYO**
- (v) **M/s Bharat Vanijya Eastern Pvt Ltd.**

4. During the last meeting on 09.03.2017 committee (ETEC) recommended that the clarifications, required as per the recommendation of the Financial Consultant, be requested from **M/s Bhartia Infra Projects Ltd., M/s Bharat Vanijya Eastern Pvt. Ltd and M/s KKB Projects Pvt. Ltd.** with due approval of the competent authority.

5. With the approval of Competent Authority, clarifications from the Applicant as suggested by the Financial Consultant were requested from **M/s Bhartia Infra Projects Ltd., M/s Bharat Vanijya Eastern Pvt. Ltd and M/s KKB Projects Pvt. Ltd.** Accordingly the replies to the queries submitted by the bidders and the recommendations of the Financial Consultant submitted on 15.03.2017 are as under:

1. M/s. Bhartia Infra Projects Ltd.

SN.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks	Remarks of ETEC
1.	<p style="text-align: center;">Responsiveness Appendix-1A Letter comprising the Technical Bid</p> <p>In point 2, word nothing is mentioned as noting.</p>	<p>The word “nothing” was printed as “noting” In Point 2 of Appendix-IA- Letter comprising the Technical Bid. As such we are submitting a fresh “Letter comprising</p>	<p>Bidder in its reply has mentioned that due to clerical error noting was printed instead of nothing. Also Bidder has submitted fresh Appendix IA.</p> <p>Fresh Appendix IA</p>	Agreed ✓

	Please Clarify.	the Technical Bid” rectifying the same for your kind consideration & necessary action please.	cannot be accepted, however as bidder has admitted that it was a clerical error and as it does not have any material impact on the Bid submitted by the Bidder, reply submitted by the Bidder may be accepted.	
--	------------------------	--	--	--

2. M/s Bharat Vanijya Eastern Pvt. Ltd.

SN.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks	Remarks of ETEC
1.	<p>Responsiveness Appendix-1A Letter comprising the Technical Bid</p> <p>In point 2, word nothing is mentioned as noting.</p> <p>Please Clarify.</p>	<p>We would like to clarify that the word “nothing” has been mention as “noting” in Appendix-1A due to the typographical error.</p> <p>We request your good – self to kindly pardon the error please. The rectified the Appendix-1A is enclosed (Pg-1-3) here with for your kind consideration.</p>	<p>Bidder in its reply has mentioned that due to typographical errornoting was mentioned instead of nothing. Also Bidder has submitted fresh Appendix IA.</p> <p>Fresh Appendix IA cannot be accepted, however as bidder has admitted that it was a clerical error and as it does not have any material impact on the Bid submitted by the Bidder, reply submitted by the Bidder may be accepted.</p>	Agreed
2.	<p>Responsiveness Appendix II</p>	The necessary	Bidder has	Agreed

	<p align="center">Bank Guarantee</p> <p>As per RFP Appendix II, The Bank Guarantee Para 14, the Bank Guarantee should be operatable at Branch at New Delhi However the bidder submitted the Bank Guarantee which is operatable at Kolkatta Branch instead of Delhi Branch of the Bank.</p> <p align="center">Please clarify along with required amendment from Bank.</p>	<p>amendment letter from the bank is enclosed (Pg-14, 15). Here with for your kind consideration Please.</p>	<p>submitted the required amendment from the bank, therefore the same may be considered.</p>	
3.	<p align="center">Technical Capacity Annex II & Annex IV</p> <p>All the projects claimed by the Bidder in Annex IV are in category 1, however certificates submitted by the Bidder are in the format of category 3 or 4 projects. Please Clarify.</p> <p align="center">Further Please clarify how the projects claimed by the Bidder cover under category 1 as per RFP.</p>	<p>We would like to clarify that due to typographical error the project code has been mistakenly mentioned as 1, where as it would have been mentioned as 3. The rectified Annex-II & Annex- IV are enclosed Pg-4 to 12 here with along with this letter.</p>	<p>In Annex II Bidder has still mentioned as category 1, however Bidder has correctly mentioned the category as 3 in Annex IV.</p> <p>Further technical capacity of the Bidder is calculated accordingly as per RFP.</p>	Agreed
4.	<p align="center">Financial Capacity Annex III</p> <p>Complete Audited Annual Reports for last five years of the Bidder are not found in the submitted Bid which is required to be submitted as per clause 2.2.2.8 (i).</p> <p align="center">Please provide the location in the submitted Bid from where the same can be found.</p>	<p>A print of the screenshot taken from our account at eprocure.gov.in website is attached (Pg13) showing the location of B/s File. We are also attaching the PDF file of the B/s along with this letter/email for your kind consideration and disposal please.</p>	<p>Bidder in its reply has submitted the screenshot of their submission of Annual Reports. Also Bidder has submitted the required Annual reports, the same may be considered.</p>	Agreed

3. M/s KKB Projects Pvt. Ltd.

SN.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks	Remarks of ETEC
1.	<p>Responsiveness Appendix-1A Letter comprising the Technical Bid</p> <p>Point 6 mentioned in Appendix IA is not as per the required format.</p> <p>Date & Place of signing of Appendix IA is not mentioned.</p> <p>Please Clarify for above points</p>	<p>Date : 27.02.2017</p> <p>Place: Surat (Attach Schedule sing & stamp)</p>	<p>Bidder has provided the requisite detail the same may be accepted.</p>	Agreed ✓
2.	<p>Responsiveness Appendix III & Annex V</p> <p>i) Date of purchase of stamp paper of Appendix III as mentioned on Stamp Paper is 27.02.2017, however Power of Attorney Execution date is 20.02.2017. Please clarify how the said POA can be executed before the purchase of Stamp paper.</p> <p>ii) Date of signing of Annex-V is 31.01.2017 and the date of execution of Appendix-III is 20.02.2017. While Board resolution submitted by the Bidder is dated 24.02.2017.</p> <p>(a) Please clarify in what capacity did Mr. Pradip V. Gajera is executing Power of Attorney in the name of Authorised Signatory or provide any charter document from where the power of Mr. Pradip V.</p>	<p>Appendix-III There was typing mistake in Power of Attorney for this work: "Rehabilitation of existing Churuchandpur-Singhat Tuvai road on NH-102 B between Km.0.000 to Km 34.5 (Length 34.50 km) in the state of Manipur on EPC basis (2nd Call)" in actual date 27 February-2017 instead of 20th February 2017. Kindly consider 27th February 2017 as the date of Power of attorney (Attach Affidavit for Clarification) Pradip V Gajera capacity of Director</p> <p>Annex-V: in actual date 27th February</p>	<p>Bidder in its reply has mentioned that there was a typing error in the execution date of POA submitted. Further they have submit an affidavit to consider the execution date as 27th February 2017 instead of 20th February 2017.</p> <p>As POA execution date is 27.02.2017, Board resolution submitted by the Bidder dated 24.02.2017in the Bid, may be accepted.</p> <p>With respect to Annex V, Bidder has mentioned that the</p>	Agreed ✓

	<p>Gajera to execute POA can be established as on 20.02.2017.</p> <p>(b) Further Please clarify how Annex-V can be signed by Authorised Signatory before 24.02.2017 i.e. before he derived the power to sign the Bid.</p>	<p>instead of 20th February-2017. Kindly consider 27th February 2017 (Attach Schedule for clarification)</p>	<p>date mentioned in Annex V was typographical, the same may be considered as it does not has any material impact on the Bid submitted by Bidder.</p>	
3.	<p>Responsiveness Appendix II Bank Guarantee</p> <p>In para 9 of Bank Guarantee submitted, name of the Bank along with Branch address is not mentioned.</p> <p>In para 14, word 'Latter' is mentioned instead of 'Letter'.</p> <p>Please clarify for above points along with required amendment from bank for modification.</p>	<p>(Attach Bank Letter for Clarification)</p>	<p>Bidder has submitted a letter from bank substantiating the required amendments; therefore the same may be considered.</p>	<p>Agreed ✓</p>
4.	<p>Financial Capacity Annex III</p> <p>Bidder is required to submit complete Audited Annual Reports for the last five years as per clause 2.2.2.8 (i) of RFP. However following documents are not found in the Annual Reports submitted by the Bidder:</p> <p>(i) Auditors Reporr for the year 2012-13 & 2013-14.</p> <p>(ii) Directors Report for all the years.</p> <p>(iii) Cash Flow Statement for the years 2011-2015</p>	<p>Complete Audit Report last Five Year was submit in technical bid for page no. 76 to 276 (Attach all Financial Document for Clarification)</p>	<p>Bidder has submitted the required documents, the same may be considered.</p>	<p>Agreed ✓</p>

(Handwritten signature)

(Handwritten signature)

(Handwritten signature)

(Handwritten signature)

(Handwritten signature)

5. Two bidders i.e. **M/s L.K. & SONS- M. Dama JV and M/s SeryyoHungyo-V. Guite** among five are not evaluated as no Joint Venture is allowed up to Estimated Project Cost of Rs. 100 Crore as per *Clause 2.1.15 (i) & 2.2.1(a)* of RFP. Therefore Bidders mentioned above are technically disqualified


6. Accordingly, in the view of report submitted by Financial Consultant Committee recommends that the bids of the three firms namely **M/s Bhartia Infra Projects Ltd., M/s Haokhotinlen Vaiphei and M/s Vilelei Khamo & Sons** met the threshold technical and financial capacity , are technically responsive in terms thereof. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the Financial Bid of the following bidders be opened with the approval of the Competent Authority:

- (i) **M/s. Bhartia Infra Projects Ltd.**
- (ii) **M/s Bharat Vanijya Eastern Pvt. Ltd.**
- (iii) **M/s KKB Projects Pvt. Ltd.**

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.



Sanjeev Malik
(ED-III)
Chairman



Col Rajeev Sood
(GM-Tech)
Member Secretary



Y C Srivastava
(GM-Tech)
Member






Sahdeokumar
DGM (Tech)
Member



Dr. Vaibhav Saxena
Manager (Finance):
Nominated by
GM(Fin) Member