

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical Division)

Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) of "Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode"- 3rd meeting of ETEC held on 07.11.2019 at NHIDCL, HQ.

The RFP for the subject work was invited with Bid Due Date as 09.10.2019 till 15:00 hrs. In all, 4 (four) bids were received from the following bidders:

Name of Work	Name of Bidders
Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode	M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.
	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited
	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited
	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited

2. ETEC in their 2nd meeting held on 04.11.2019 examined the clarifications submitted by all the bidders and recommended the followings:

- i) The Committee upon detailed deliberation on the Financial Consultant report observed that **M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited and M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited** are fulfilling the RFP criteria of responsiveness and hence declared **Technically Responsive**.
- ii) Committee declared M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd. **Technically Non-Responsive** for next stage of bidding in pursuant to **Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)**.
- iii) Committee further mentioned that **M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited** will be scrutinized after obtaining requisite documents from the bidder i.e. Value of B as per annexure-VI & duly signed copy of Statutory Auditor for Annexure-III of RFP (by giving 3 days time) to the bidder.

3. Accordingly, letters seeking clarification was sent to M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited vide letter dated 04.11.2019. In response, bidders vide their email dated 06.11.2019 has submitted the requisite documents duly signed by Statuary Auditor within the stipulated time and the same were forwarded to the Financial Consultant **M/s. Indraprastha Corridor Advisory Services (P) Ltd.** for further examining as per RFP provisions. Financial Consultant vide their letter no. ICAS/NHIDCL/Andaman-Nicobar/EPC/2019-20/4800 dated 07.11.2019 has submitted their Final evaluation report and recommended **M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited** as Technically responsive for Financial Opening as per RFP provisions.



4. The Committee upon deliberation on the Financial Consultant's report recommends the following:

S. No	Name of Bidder's	Status of Eligibility
1.	M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd	Technically Non-Responsive for next stage of bidding
2.	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited	Technically Responsive for next stage of bidding
3.	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited	Technically Responsive for next stage of bidding
4.	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited	Technically Responsive for next stage of bidding.

5. Committee further recommended that financial bids of Technically Responsive Bidders may be opened after 7 (seven) days to get representations, if any from the bidders, after taking approval of the Competent Authority.

The Meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.



V K Singh
(ED-IV)
Chairman



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



Shashank
Kumar
(GM-Tech)
Member

o/o
On duty

V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member



Mahesh Gupta
DGM (Finance)
Member

- 1 -

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical Division)

Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) of "Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode"- 2nd meeting of ETEC held on 04.11.2019 at NHIDCL, HQ.

The RFP for the subject work was invited with Bid Due Date as 09.10.2019 till 15:00 hrs. In all, 4 (four) bids were received from the following bidders:

Name of Work	Name of Bidders
Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode	M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.
	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited
	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited
	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited

2. Financial Consultant in their preliminary Evaluation Report dated 21.10.2019, recommended to seek clarifications from all the 4 (four) bidders vis-à-vis M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd., M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd., M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd. & M/s Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd. to consolidate the evaluation. Accordingly, ETEC in their 1st meeting held on 22.10.2019 decided to seek clarifications from all the bidders mentioned in above table on or before 28.10.2019 upto 1800 hrs.

3. Letters seeking clarification were sent to all the bidders vide letter dated 22.10.2019. In response, all the bidders have submitted their clarification except from M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd. within the stipulated time and the same were forwarded to the Financial Consultant M/s. Indraprastha Corridor Advisory Services (P) Ltd. for further examining as per RFP provisions. Financial Consultant vide their letter no. ICAS/NHIDCL/Andaman-Nicobar/EPC/2019-20/4793 dated 04.11.2019 has submitted their evaluation report, details of which is mentioned below in tabular form:

(i) M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited:-

S.No.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks of the Financial Consultant	Recommendation by ETEC Committee
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bid Security Amount under Point 20 of Appendix IA is wrong. Bank Guarantee Validity is short by 5 days. <p>Kindly clarify and submit the revised Letter Comprising Technical Bid and Amended Bank Guarantee of the required</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bid Security Amount under Point 20 of Appendix IA is corrected and revised Letter Comprising Technical Bid is submitted for consideration. Amended Bank Guarantee duly extending its validity is enclosed for 	The revised Letter Comprising Technical Bid & Amendment Letter to Bank Guarantee now submitted is in proper order and the same may be acceptable to the Authority	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.

	validity	consideration.		
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Annex II and Annex IV, bidder claimed two projects under Category 3. However category of roads cannot be identified. Further in project no. 2, Name of the project and Cost mentioned in Annex II is different from certificate. Kindly clarify and submit supporting documents in support of your claim. 	<p>The bidder has stated that the work was carried out on State Highway which was under P.W.D. Delhi Jurisdiction. Accordingly claimed under Category 3. Further the name & cost of project has been corrected in Certificate, the copy of which is enclosed for consideration.</p>	<p>In project No. 2, although the name of project has been corrected in enclosed certificate but still the cost of project is different. Since client certificate is also attached in the bid in support of Statutory Auditor Certificate and moreover this does not have any major impact on the Bid, as such the same may be acceptable to the Authority.</p> <p>With regards to Category of Roads, since the bidder has just stated the work was carried out on State Highway, as such both the claimed projects have been considered under Category 3. Further the said projects also falls under clause 2.2.2.5 IV) iii) which states that "Widening/ reconstruction / up-gradation work/slope protection works of roads in Municipal corporation limits, construction of Bypasses", to be considered under Category 1 or 3</p>	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.

ii) M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited:-

S.No.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks of the Financial Consultant	Recommendation by ETEC Committee
1	<p>Integrity Pact, Undertaking to abide by the Bidding documents & Memorandum of Association (MOA) has not been submitted in the Bid.</p> <p>Kindly clarify and submit the missing documents.</p>	<p>The bidder has with its reply submitted the Integrity Pact, Undertaking to abide by the Bidding documents, duly signed by its Authorized Signatory</p> <p>Further bidder has stated that they are once again submitting its Memorandum of Association (MOA) for consideration.</p>	<p>Since the Integrity Pact and Undertaking to abide by the bidding documents has now been submitted, the same is correct and may be acceptable to the Authority.</p> <p>With regards to MOA, the bidder has stated that they are once again providing copy of its MOA but the same is not attached with the Bidder's Reply.</p> <p>Since MOA was submitted physically at the time of bid submission. We have checked the same from physical submission. Accordingly the same is correct and may be acceptable to Authority.</p>	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.
2.	<p>Power of Attorney is executed by Mr. Aditya Jain (Director) and in favor of Mr. Aditya Jain (Director).</p>	<p>The bidder has now provided the POA which has been executed by Mrs. Anjana Jain (Director of the Company) for</p>	<p>The POA now submitted has been executed by Mrs. Anjana Jain in favor of Mr. Aditya Jain, however the acceptance of POA is missing. But the same may be acceptable to Authority as it does not have any material impact</p>	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.

[Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink at the bottom of the page]

	Bidder is requested to kindly clarify with supporting documents, if any, how Mr. Aditya Jain is executing the POA itself in its own favor.	Consideration.	on the Bid.	
3.	<p>Discrepancies with regards to Certificate submitted with the Annex IV Detail of Eligible Projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion date is not appearing in both the Certificates In Certificate 1, project cost is different <p>Kindly clarify and submit the revised Statutory Auditor Certificate</p>	Revised Statutory Auditor Certificates duly rectifying the mistakes are enclosed for consideration	The revised Statutory Auditor Certificates submitted is correct and the same may be acceptable to the Authority.	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.

(iii) M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited:-

S. No.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks of the Financial Consultant	Recommendation by ETEC Committee
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Power of Attorney - Date of signing of POA is not mentioned. Bid Security Amount under Point 20 of Appendix IA is wrong. Annex-I (Detail of Bidders) is not complete <p>Kindly clarify and submit the revised Appendix IA, POA & Complete Annex I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The missing date has been mentioned in POA Bid Security Amount under Point 20 of Appendix IA is corrected and revised Letter Comprising Technical Bid is submitted for consideration. Complete Annex I is enclosed for consideration. 	The revised Letter Comprising Technical Bid, Annex I & missing date in POA now submitted is in proper order and the same may be acceptable to the Authority.	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of 2018-19 Annex VIII (Details of ongoing works) is not complete in the Bid Annex V- Statement of Legal 	The bidder has now provided Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of 2018-19 along with complete Annex VIII (Details of ongoing works) and Annex V (Statement of Legal capacity) for consideration	Since the required documents have now been provided, the same may be acceptable to Authority.	We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.

	<p>capacity is not submitted in the Bid</p> <p>Kindly clarify in this regard and submit the missing/ revised documents</p>			
<p>3.</p>	<p>Annex VI (Information required to evaluate the Bid Capacity)</p> <p>The details regarding the same are missing in the Bid.</p> <p>The bidder needs to clarify in this regard and submit the complete details as required under Annex VI along with supporting documents if any.</p>	<p>The Bidder has submitted the details of Value of A & C as required under Annex VI</p>	<p>Although the Bidder has submitted the details of Value of A & C as required under Annex VI, however the note under value of B which states that <i>"The Statement showing the value of all existing commitments, anticipated value of work to be completed in the period of construction of the project for which bid is invited and ongoing works as well as the stipulated period of completion remaining for each of the works mentioned above is verified from the certificate issued that has been countersigned by the Client or its Engineer- in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer or equivalent in respect of EPC Projects or Concessionaire / Authorised Signatory of SPV in respect of BOT Projects. No awarded / ongoing works has been left in the aforesaid statement which has been awarded to M/s.....individually / and other member M/s and M/s, as on bid due date of this RFP."</i>, is missing.</p> <p>Further Bidder own calculations of Bid Capacity is not there in the Bid.</p> <p>In this regard, the status of bid is kept pending for clarification subject to furnishing of complete information of Bid Capacity (Value of A, B & C) duly certified by its Statutory Auditor along with its calculation as per format enclosed at Annex VI of RFP.</p>	<p>For calculation of bid capacity value of A, B & C duly signed from the bidder is required. Bidder has submitted value of A & C only whereas duly signed copy of Statutory Auditor for the value of B is not submitted by the bidder. Though, Consultant has calculated bid Capacity of Rs. 11.10 Crore based on the unsigned submitted documents online with bid. Committee opined that the Value of B as per annexure-VI may be obtained giving 3 days of time to the bidder.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>In Annex III – Net worth has not specified by Auditor and its methodology also has not been provided. However Bank Details are also missing.</p>	<p>The bidder has self-certified Annex III along with providing details of their Bankers</p>	<p>Although the bidder has self-certified the details of Annex III, however the same need to be certified by the Statutory Auditor of the Company as per Instruction No. 7 given under Annex III read with clause 2.2.2.9 (ii) of RFP.</p> <p>In this regard, the status of bid is kept pending for clarification subject to furnishing of complete</p>	<p>For calculation of Net worth, Financial Capacity duly certified by its Statutory Auditor as per Annexure-III of RFP is required, Bidder in their clarification has self certified the details of Annexure-III whereas duly signed copy of</p>

Handwritten signatures and initials are present at the bottom of the page, including a large blue checkmark on the left and several scribbles and initials in blue ink across the bottom edge.

— 5 —

<p>The bidder is advised to clarify in this regard and provide a revised copy of the same duly complete in all aspects</p>		<p>information of Financial Capacity duly certified by its Statutory Auditor as per Annex III of RFP document</p>	<p>Statutory Auditor for Annexure-III of RFP is not submitted by the bidder. Though, Consultant has calculated Net worth as Rs. 5.56 Crore based on the self certified submitted documents. Thus, Committee opined that the duly signed copy of Statutory Auditor for Annexure-III of RFP may be obtained giving 3 days of time to the bidder.</p>
--	--	---	--

(iv) M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd:-

S. No.	Clarification Sought	Reply Received	Remarks of the Financial Consultant	Recommendation by ETEC Committee
1	<p>Undertaking to abide by Bidding Document, undertaking regarding non-audit of Financial of 2018-19, Annex V- Statement of Legal Capacity & Integrity pact was missing in the Bid.</p> <p>Kindly clarify and submit the revised documents complete in all aspects</p>	<p>The Bidder with its reply has provided Undertaking to abide by Bidding Document, undertaking regarding non-audit of Financial of 2018-19, Annex V- Statement of Legal Capacity & Integrity pact, as they are missing in the Bid, for consideration</p>	<p>The Undertaking to abide by Bidding Document, undertaking regarding non-audit of Financial of 2018-19, Annex V- Statement of Legal Capacity & Integrity pact now submitted is in proper order and the same may be acceptable to the Authority</p>	<p>We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.</p>
2.	<p>It has been observed that Power of Attorney is in favour of Mr. Manu Thomas and Bid is digitally signed by Mr. Sanjeev Trehan. Hence the person authorised in POA and person who digitally signed the Bid is Different.</p> <p>Bidder is requested to kindly clarify in this regard and submit supporting documents.</p>	<p>The bidder has now provided Undertaking certifying that Mr. Sanjeev Trehan & Mr. Manu Thomas, both are directors of the Company. Further we authorized Mr. Manu Thomas to sign the bid documents. Thus requesting to consider the same</p>	<p>Since the required undertaking have now been provided, the same may be acceptable to Authority.</p>	<p>We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.</p>
3.	<p>Annex II (Technical Capacity & Annex IV (Details of Eligible Projects)</p> <p>The Bidder is claiming one project of Rs. 4.52</p>	<p>The Bidder has now submitted additional project regarding construction of office building at Plot No 2 &3, Tolstoy Lane, New Delhi, for</p>	<p>Since the documents provided w.r.t. Project at Tolstoy Lane is an additional document and the same cannot be considered for evaluation now as the same was not submitted with the Bid of M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.</p>	<p>We may agree with the remarks of Financial Consultant.</p>

	<p>Creore in Annex II and Annex IV. However the minimum technical threshold required is Rs. 6.31 Crore. Hence the Bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold in terms of Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)</p> <p>The bidder needs to clarify in this regard and submit supporting documents if any, supporting its claim.</p>	consideration.	<p>Further the project attached in the Bid is also a Building Project and the same cannot be considered as Highway Project</p> <p>In view of foregoing, since only one project of Rs. 4.52 Cr was attached in the Bid, as such Bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold in terms of Clause 2.2.2.2 (i). Thus it becomes Non Responsive & Non Eligible</p>
--	--	----------------	--

4. Financial Consultant in their report dated 04.11.2019 has mentioned the results with respect to Responsiveness, Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and Bid Capacity of all the bidders, as summarized in the table below:

Sl. No.	Name of the Bidder	Technical Capacity		Financial Capacity		Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 6.31 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)	Remarks
		Experience Assessed (Required = Rs. 6.31 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)	Score Whether Bidder meets 25% of EPC (i.e. Rs. 1.58 Cr) required in category 1 & 3 project	Net Worth Assessed (Required = Rs. 0.32 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr)	Average Annual Turnover (Required = Rs. 1.26 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)		
1.	M/s AECS Engineering & geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.	The Bidder is claiming one project of Rs. 4.52 Crore in Annex II and Annex IV. However the minimum technical threshold required is Rs. 6.31 Crore. Hence the Bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold in terms of Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)		Rs. 3.97 Cr	Rs. 13.82 Cr	Rs. 21.16 Cr	Non-Eligible as the Bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold in terms of Clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP
2.	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited	Rs. 16.74 Cr	Project Code A Cost-Rs. 19.51 Cr	Rs. 9.15 Cr	Rs. 33.82 Cr	Rs. 20.94 Cr	Eligible for Financial Bid Opening
3.	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited	Rs. 28.76 Cr	Project Code B Cost-Rs. 22.51 Cr	Rs. 4.83 Cr	Rs. 20.02 Cr	Rs. 41.54 Cr	Eligible for Financial Bid Opening
4.	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited	Rs. 18.18 Cr.	Project Code D Cost-Rs. 2.93 Cr	Rs. 5.56 Cr	Rs.19.77	Rs. 11.10 Cr	Pending for documents mentioned in para 3 (iii) above.



5. Recommendations of the ETEC:

- i) The Committee upon detailed deliberation on the Financial Consultant report observes that **M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited** and **M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited** are fulfilling the RFP criteria of responsiveness and hence declared **Technically Responsive**.
- ii) Committee declares **M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.** **Technically Non-Responsive** for next stage of bidding in pursuant to **Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)**.
- iii) Committee further mentioned that **M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited** will be scrutinized once requisite documents received from the bidder.

The status of technical qualification of all bidders as recommended by ETEC is reproduced as under:

S. No	Name of Bidder's	Status of Eligibility
1	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited	Technically Responsive for next stage of bidding
2	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited	Technically Responsive for next stage of bidding
3	M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd	Technically Non-Responsive for next stage of bidding
4	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited	It will be scrutinized in next meeting for qualification.

The Meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.


V K Singh
(ED-IV)
Chairman


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


Shashank
Kumar
(GM-Tech)
Member


V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member


Mahesh Gupta
DGM (Finance)
Member



National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical Division)

Evaluation of Technical Bids for "Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode"-Empowered Technical Bid Evaluation Committee (ETEC) held on 22.10.2019 at NHIDCL, HQ.

The RFP for the subject work was invited with Bid Due Date as 09.10.2019 till 15:00 hrs.

2. ETBC in its Minutes of Meeting dated 10.10.2019 has opened the Technical bids received from 4 (Four) bidders namely M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd., M/s AECS Engineering & Geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd., M/s HMBS Textiles Pvt. Ltd. & M/s Ravi Realcon Pvt. Ltd.

3. The hard copy of the original documents along with the soft copy as received from e-procurement portal (CPPP) were handed over to the concerned Financial Consultant M/s. **Indraprastha Corridor Advisory Services (P) Ltd.** for carrying out the evaluation of the Technical Bids as per the RFP provisions. The Financial Consultant of the package had submitted interim report dated 16.10.2019 mentioning that there is need of clarification to be asked from all the 4 (Four) bidders based on the stipulated evaluation criteria mentioned in the RFP. Details of clarifications to be sought are tabulated below:

Sr. No	Bidder Name	Reference	Observations
1	M/s AECS Engineering & geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.	General	<p>i) It has been observed that Power of Attorney is in favour of Mr. Manu Thomas and Bid is digitally signed by Mr. Sanjeev Trehan. Hence the person authorized in POA and person who digitally signed the Bid is Different. Bidder to clarify.</p> <p>ii) Integrity Pact and Undertaking is not submitted by Bidder Bidder is requested to submit Integrity pact and Undertaking as it is mentioned in Clause 2.11.1 to submit the same.</p>
		Annex II (Technical Capacity of Bidder) and Annex IV (Details of Eligible Projects)	<p>iii) The Bidder is claiming one project of Rs. 4.52 Crore in Annex II and Annex IV. However the minimum technical threshold required is Rs. 6.31 Crore. Hence the Bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold in terms of Clause 2.2.2.2 (i) Bidder to clarify.</p> <p>iv) Category of road cannot be identified. Further Completion date is not there in Statutory Auditor Certificate. Bidder to clarify.</p>
		Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of 2018-19	<p>v) The Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of Financial Year 2018-19 is not given as required under Clause 2.2.2.8(ii). Accordingly figures of Four FY i.e.</p>

			<p>from FY 2014-15 to FY 2017-18 have been considered for evaluation.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify why such undertaking has not been provided.</p>
		Annex V (Statement of Legal Capacity)	vi) Annex V submitted by Bidder is not in proper Format as given in RFP. The bidder is requested to resubmit Annex V in proper Format.
2	M/s Chaudhary Construction Company Private Limited	General	<p>i) Appendix IA- Letter Comprising Technical Bid</p> <p>It has been observed that under Point 20 of Appendix IA submitted with the bid, the amount of Bid security mentioned is Incorrect. Bidder to clarify and submit the revised Appendix IA-Letter Comprising Technical Bid.</p> <p>ii) Bank Guarantee Validity is short by 5 days</p> <p>Bidder to clarify and submit the modified extended validity of Bank Guarantee.</p>
		Annex II (Technical Capacity of Bidder) and Annex IV (Details of Eligible Projects) and	<p>iii) In Annex II and Annex IV, bidder claimed two projects under Category 3. However category of roads cannot be identified. Further in project no. 2, Name of the project and Cost mentioned in Annex II is different from certificate.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify alongwith relevant documents.</p>
3	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited	General	<p>i) Memorandum of Association, Integrity Pact and Undertaking is not submitted by Bidder</p> <p>Bidder to clarify & submit Memorandum of Association, Integrity pact and Undertaking as it is mentioned in Clause 2.11.1 to submit the same.</p> <p>ii) Power of Attorney is signed by Mr. Aditya Jain (Director) however POA is also in favour of Mr. Aditya Jain (Director). How can the same person giving authority to himself.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify alongwith relevant documents.</p>
		Annex IV (Details of Eligible Projects)	<p>iii) In project 1 of Annex IV, on CA Certificate Completion date is not appearing however completion date is appearing in client certificate only. Further the Bidder is claiming Total Score of Rs. 8.56 Crore however CA is certifying only Rs. 6.41 Crore. Hence considered the amount certified by Bidder.</p> <p>In project 2 of Annex IV, Completion date is not appearing in CA Certificate.</p> <p>Bidder to clarify alongwith relevant documents.</p>
4	M/s Ravi Realcon Private	General	i) In Power of Attorney - Date of signing of POA is not mentioned.

Limited		ii) Appendix IA- Letter Comprising Technical Bid It has been observed that under Point 20 of Appendix IA submitted with the bid, the amount of Bid security mentioned is Incorrect in numbers as well as in words. Bidder to clarify in this regard and submit the revised Appendix IA- Letter Comprising Technical Bid.
		iii) Annex I i.e. Details of Bidder is in Image Form and incomplete. Bidder to clarify & to submit Annex I in complete format.
	Annex VI (Information required to evaluate the Bid Capacity)	iv) In Annex VI - Bid capacity Calculation/Working is not given. Bidder to clarify.
	Annex III (Financial Capacity of the Bidder)	v) In Annex III - Net worth has not been specified by Auditor and its methodology also has not been provided. However Bank Details are also missing. Bidder to clarify.
	Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of 2018-19	vi) Undertaking regarding non- audit of Financials of 2018-19 has not been given instead Provisional Financials attached. Bidder to clarify.
	Annex VIII (Details of ongoing works)	vii) Annex VIII is attached in PDF Format but the data is not complete. The bidder is advised to resubmit Annex VIII in its complete form.
	Annex V (Statement of Legal Capacity)	viii) Annex V is not submitted by Bidder. The bidder is advised to resubmit Annex V.

4. The committee discussed the report submitted by the Consultant and decided to seek reply/clarification from all the bidders on or before 28.10.2019 upto 1800 hrs.

5. Meeting ended with Vote of thanks to Chair.


V K Singh
(ED-IV)
Chairman


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


Shashank
Kumar
(GM-Tech)
Member


V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member


Mahesh Gupta
DGM (Finance)
Member

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation
(Technical division)

Empowered Technical Bid opening Committee (ETBC) met to open Technical Bid for "Slope Protection/rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi on 10.10.2019.

The RFPs for the subject work were invited with Bid Due Date as **09.10.2019** till **15:00 hrs.**

2. On receipt of bids, Technical Bids have been opened on 10.10.2019 at **15:00 hrs** in the presence of applicant's representatives, who choose to attend.
3. The following firms have submitted their bids on due date and time.

Name of Work	Name of Bidders
Slope Protection/ rebuilding, miscellaneous works at 4 locations, in Jarwa Area from Km 59.400 to Km 107.000 And road safety works & road marking between Km 59.400 to Km 107.00 and Km 138.3 to Km 155.00 of NH-223 (New NH-4) in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on EPC Mode	M/s AECS Engineering & geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.
	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited
	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited
	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited

4. The Bids were opened online as well as physically and details of bids are tabulated below:

Sl. No.	Details of document to be submitted as per RFP	Name of Bidders			
		M/s AECS Engineering & geotechnical Services Pvt. Ltd.	M/s Chaudhary Constructions Company Private Limited	M/s HMBS Textiles Private Limited	M/s Ravi Realcon Private Limited
1.	Original Power of Attorney for signing the bid if sole firm	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.	Original power of Attorney for the Authorized Representative in case of partnership firm of company	-	-	-	-
3.	Original power of Attorney for the Authorized Representative in case JV	-	-	-	-

[Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink]

4.	Bid Security Rs. 6.31 Lakh (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5.	Cost of RFP of Rs. 10,000/-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.	Whether Authorized signatory holding POA and DSC holder are same	No	Yes	Yes	Yes


5. The hard copy of the original documents along with the soft copy (as received from E-bidding service portal viz. <https://eprocure.gov.in>) was handed over to the concerned Financial Consultants M/s. **Indraprastha Corridor Advisory Services (P) Ltd.** for carrying out the evaluation of the Technical Bids as per provisions stipulated in the RFP documents.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.


V K Singh
(ED-IV)
Chairman


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


Shashank
Kumar
(GM-Tech)
Member


V. Jaiswal
DGM (Tech)
Member


Manager
(Finance)
Member