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
BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE - BUILDING THE NATION
CIN: U45400DL2014GOI269062
(भारत सरकार का उद्यम) (A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/AP/Akajan-Likabali/Balance Work/2021 **Date: 26.06.2021**

To

All Respective Bidders,

Subject: - Construction of Balance work of 2 – Laning of existing Akajan-Likabali-Bame Road on EPC basis from design Km 33.00 to Km 65.810 (Existing km 36.00 to km 71.00) in the state of Arunachal Pradesh under SARDP-NE- **Financial Bid Opening-Reg.**

Sir,

Refer Tender ID: **2021_NHIDC_624351_1** with bid due date 10.06.2021.

Please refer to bid submitted for the subject cited above. The following is the result of technical evaluation. The minutes of technical evaluation is enclosed.

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Status
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	**Technically non Responsive**
2	M/s Ganpati Builders	**Technically non Responsive**
3	M/s Jony Enterprises	**Technically non Responsive**
4	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	Technically Responsive
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	Technically Responsive
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	Technically Responsive
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	Technically Responsive
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
9	M/s PK & Company	Technically Responsive

10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises	Technically Responsive
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive
12	M/s Salo Enterprises	Technically Responsive
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	**Technically non Responsive**
16	M/s LG Chaudhary	Technically Responsive
17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	Technically Responsive
19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	Technically Responsive
20	M/s Buru Enterprise	Technically Responsive

2. Financial bid of technical responsive bidders shall be opened on 29.06.2021 at 1500 hrs in NHIDCL HQ, 3rd floor, PTI building, 4, Parliament Street, New Delhi- 110001.

Encl.:- **As above.**

Yours faithfully,

(A.K.Jha)

General Manager (T)

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation

2nd Minutes of Meetings of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) for "Construction of Balance work of 2 – Laning of existing Akajan-Likabali-Bame Road on EPC basis from design Km 33.00 to Km 65.810 (Existing km 36.00 to km 71.00) in the state of Arunachal Pradesh under SARDP-NE" held at NHIDCL, New Delhi at 1530 Hrs on 24.06.2021.

1. The bids for the subject work were invited and bids were received online on scheduled bid due date as 10.06.2021 at 1500 hrs.

2. The following bidders have submitted their bids online on 11.06.2021.

(i) M/s Buru Enterprises
(ii) M/s Dagmo Riba
(iii) M/s Ganpati Builders
(iv) M/s Jony Enterprises
(v) M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.
(vi) M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma
(vii) M/s M V V Satyanaryana
(viii) M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed
(ix) M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.
(x) M/s PK & Company
(xi) M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises
(xii) M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd
(xiii) M/s Salo Enterprises
(xiv) M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.
(xv) M/s Shreehari Associates Pvt. Ltd.
(xvi) M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited
(xvii) M/s LG Chaudhary
(xviii) M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.
(xix) M/s Sri Harsha Constructions
(xx) M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor

3. The Evaluation Committee in reference to RFP has considered the following Evaluation Criteria for estimated project cost of **Rs 118 Crore.**

Sr.No.	Particulars	Amount in Rs. Cr.
1	Estimated Project Cost	118.00
2	Minimum Threshold Technical Capacity required (For Category 1, 2, 3 & 4) as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i)	59
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)	35.4
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)	11.80
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)	17.70
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))	5.90
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))	5.90
9	Minimum Financial capacity required as per clause 2.2.2.3	5.90
10	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Lead Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	3.54
11	Minimum Financial Capacity required for Other Member to fulfill as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	1.18
12	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (ii)	17.70
13	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	10.62
14	Minimum Average Annual Turnover required (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	3.54
15	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For each Bidder) as per clause 2.2.2.1	59
16	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Lead Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	35.40
17	Minimum Required Bid Capacity (For Other Member) as per clause 2.2.2.4 (i)	11.80

4. **The Evaluation Committee** 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 clarification may be sought from the Bidders as per clause no 3.1.4 of the RFP to facilitate the evaluation process. Accordingly, the **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** in its first meeting had 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 **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** held on 16.06.2021, replies received from the bidders, the Evaluation report were deliberated by the TEC in 2nd meeting held on 24.06.2021. The remarks of TEC w.r.t. the observations and reply received are tabulated below:

S.No	Name of the Bidder	Clarification to be sought	Reply received by the bidder	NHIDCL's Comment
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Re submit Audited Balance sheet for FY 2019-20 in clear Print.	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work. (ii) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance sheet for FY 2019- 20	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and it was observed that the bidder has submitted three projects which are as follows (i) Construction Road from Pessing to Bogne (31.500 Km) Stage-II. (ii) Construction of Road to Hanoi Mahasu at Hanoi in Pauri District, Uttarakhand (24.85 Km) Stage-I

				(iii) Construction of approach road to model degree college of Basar. Since all the projects are neither on NH/ SH or funded project for road work, hence it has been considered Technically **Non-responsive.**
2	M/s Ganpati Builders	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify (iii) As per RFP 2.2.2.8 " Submission in Support of Financial Capacity" Audited Balance sheet of the firm are required for FY 2019-20, 2018-19, 2017-18,2016-17, 2015-16, it has been observed that Consolidated Audited Balance sheet for FY 2019-20, 2018-19, 2017-18 are submitted in the bid . Please clarify (iv) Re- submit Audited Balance Sheet for FY 2015-16, 2016-17 in clear Print.	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work. (ii) The bidder has submitted Annexure IV as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder has submitted Audited balance sheet of all five years. (iv) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2015-16, 2016-17 in clear Print.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee it was observed that the bidder has submitted Consolidated Audited Balance Sheet for FY 2019-20, 2018-19, 2017-18 which cannot be accepted for the Evaluation. Since the bidder has submitted latest Audited Financial Year 2019-20 consolidated Balance sheet. The Net worth of the Firm cannot be arrived from the consolidated balance sheet. The firm has been asked to submit the separate balance sheet, however they failed to do so within the given time. Hence committee could not verify / arrived at net worth of the firm and considered the bid as financially non-responsive

		(v) Appendix X , XI could not be located. Please clarify. (vi) Power of Attorney could not be located. Please clarify. (vii) Statutory Certificate along with client certificate of the following projects could not be located. (a) Construction of By Pass around Narnaul Town in Mohindergarh District. (b) Providing Periodical Renewal on Nh-22 (New NH-5) Km. 0/0 to 24/250 (Excluding 13/0 to 20/495) on Shimla Bye Pass in the state of Himachal Pradesh. (c) Improvement/ widening of Baroti Rakhera Dharampur-Marhi-Kamlah Galu road Km. 0/0 to Km 30/375 job no. CRF HP-2099-10-50.	(v) The bidder has submitted Appendix X,XI as per RFP format. (vi) The bidder has submitted POA as per RFP format. (vii) The bidder has not submitted Statutory Auditor Certificate for the asked projects.	It was also bought to the notice of the committee that the as per RFP clause 2.2.2.1 the bid capacity of the firm should be more than 50% of the EPC i.e. Rs 59 Cr but the bidder has bid capacity of Rs 31.15 Cr which is less than the required. Since the bidder has failed to qualify the technically (Bid Capacity) and Financially (Net worth) . Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive.
3	M/s Jony Enterprises	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Audited Balance sheet for all five years could	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work. (ii) The bidder has submitted the Audited	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee as per RFP clause 2.2.2.3 the net worth should be 5% of the EPC i.e. Rs 5.90 Cr whereas the bidder has net worth of Rs. 4.55 Cr which is less than the

		not be located. Please Clarify.	Balance sheet of all five years.	required. Therefore the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive.
4	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Appendix X, XI could not be located. Please clarify. (iii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work. (ii) The bidder has submitted Appendix X, XI as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Statutory Auditor Certificate for project Code H could not be located. Please clarify. (iii) Annexure VI for	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work. (ii) The bidder clarifies not to considered project code H for the evaluation and claimed the Technical Threshold Capacity to be Rs 87.95 Cr. (iii) The bidder has	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

		calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	submitted statutory auditor certificate for Annexure VI.	
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	(i) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify (ii) Annexure IV for all projects submitted for eligible projects not submitted as per RFP Format. Please Clarify. (iii) Audited Balance Sheet for FY 2019-20 could not be located. Please Clarify (iv) Re submit Audited Balance Sheet for 2017-18 in clear print. Please Clarify. (v) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted annexure IV as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance Sheet of FY 2019-20 as per RFP format. (iv) The bidder has submitted Audited Balance Sheet for 2017-18 in clear print. (v) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for annexure IV.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence

		(ii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years.	(ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for turnover value.	the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict five year Turnover value. Please clarify. (ii) Cost of tender reference number does not match with the record. (iii) Power of Attorney for lead member of Joint Venture could not be located. Please clarify. (iv) Joint Bidding Agreement for Joint Venture could not be located. Please clarify. (v) Integrity Pact Both Lead Member and Other Member could not be located. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depicts five year turnover value. (ii) The bidder has submitted cost of tender reference number which matches with the records. (iii) The bidder has submitted Power of Attorney for lead member of Joint Venture as per RFP format. (iv) The bidder has submitted Joint Bidding Agreement for Joint Venture as per RFP format. (v) The bidder has submitted Integrity Pact Both Lead Member and Other Member as per RFP format.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
9	M/s PK & Company	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) As per Audited Balance sheet submitted of FY 2019-	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work (ii) The bidder clarifies that the " values of work in	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee. It was bought to the notice of the committee that the clarification was sought for turnover detail year wise as it was not clear from the P& L

		20, 2018-19, 2017-18,2016-17, 2015-16 the average annual Turnover of the Firm is Rs 11.74 Cr but as per RFP 2.2.2.3 the Annual Average Turnover should be 15% of the EPC i.e. Rs 17.70 Cr. Please clarify. (i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify	progress" to be include for the calculation of Annual Average turnover as per their calculation the Annual Average Turnover is calculated as Rs 29.47 Cr (iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict year wise break up of receivable value	account submitted. However, it was clarified that statement attached as Contract Post is equal to the trading account from which the receipt/ turnover from civil work can be seen. Accordingly receipt excluding GST is considered for the financial evaluation. The committee deliberated the issue, Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises	**(a) M/s Puna Hinda** (i) Units are not mentioned in UDIN on ICAI portal for Appendix x. Please clarify (ii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify. (iii)Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify **(b) M/s N.M Enterprises** (i) UDIN on ICAI portal	**(i) M/s Puna Hinda** (i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for Appendix X as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder clarifies that the Value of B is a typographical error and the value of ongoing work is nil. **(ii) M/s N.M Enterprises** (i) The bidder has	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

		does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify. (ii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	submitted UDIN number for year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format.	
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	**(a) M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.** (i) Units are not mentioned in UDIN on ICAI portal for Appendix x. Please clarify (ii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years. (iii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify. (iv) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	**(a) M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.** (i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X as per Format. (ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depicts year wise turnover value. (iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV. (iv) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

		(v) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	(v) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP Format.	
		(b) M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	**(b) M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd**	
		(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years.	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X as per Format.	
		(ii) Units are not mentioned in UDIN on ICAI portal for Appendix x. Please clarify	(ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depicts year wise turnover value.	
		(iii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify.	(iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which reflects year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV.	
		(iv) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify.	(iv) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work	
		(v) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	(v) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP Format	

12	M/s Salo Enterprises	(i) Units are not mentioned in UDIN on ICAI portal for Appendix x. Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number which depict units for appendix X.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	(i) Appendix X to be submitted for latest Audited Financial year. Please clarify. (ii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify. (iii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years.	(i) The bidder has submitted Appendix X as per RFP format. (ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for Annexure IV for all projects. (iii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for turnover.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify. (ii) Appendix X, XI could	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN umber which depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV. (ii) The bidder has submitted	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as

		not be located. Please clarify.	Annexure x, xi as per RFP format.	Technically responsive.
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	(i) Audited Balance sheet for all five year could not be located. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (iii) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise break up of receivable value submitted for Annexure IV of all projects. Please clarify (iv) Appendix X, XI could not be located. Please clarify (v) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify	The bidder has not Submitted Clarification till date.	It was bought to the notice of the committee that the bidder has not submitted clarification till date. The committee deliberated the issue and scrutinize the submitted bid. It was observed by the committee that the bidder has submitted un audited Annual Report of all five year which cannot be accepted for the Evaluation as per RFP clause 2.2.2.8 the bidder has to submit the Audited Annual report of all last five year. It was bought to the notice of the committee that the bidder has not submitted Appendix X, XI as per RFP format. Since the bidder has failed to submit the clarification and the bid is not submitted as per RFP format, as per RFP clause 3.1.4 & 3.1.5 the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically non responsive

16	M/s LG Chaudhary	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years. (ii) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (iii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify (iv) The Power of Attorney for Signing of Bid could not be located.	(i) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for Turnover. (ii) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work (iii) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format. (iv) The bidder has submitted Power of Attorney as per RFP format.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify (ii) Annexure VI for calculation of value of B along with Authority Certificate could not be located. Please clarify (iii) Cost of tender transaction date was 06.03.2021, however the tender published date is 25.03.2021.Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work (ii) The bidder has submitted Annexure VI as per RFP format. (iii) The bidder clarifies that "We have done tender transaction of work which was online on (06.03.2021), but we decided not to participate in that tender. So we use that tender	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

			transaction in this bid tender (25.03.2021) which was unutilized. Please consider the facts and oblige us."	
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	(i) For consideration of single work under category 1 & 3, experience certificate from the authority could not be located .Please identify the page number and clarify. (ii) Cost of tender transaction date was 22.03.2021, however the tender published date is 25.03.2021.Please clarify.	(i) The bidder has submitted the certificate for consideration of single work (ii) The bidder clarifies that "we are regularly bidding NHIDCL Projects, cost of tender transaction were paid early to avoid any network problems during submission of tenders. Kindly accept the same for this tender also."	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.
19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	(i) UDIN on ICAI portal does not depict year wise turnover value of all five years.	(ii) The bidder has submitted UDIN number for turnover.	The reply submitted by the bidder has been scrutinized by the committee and found to be in order. Since the bidder is technically and financially eligible. Hence the committee decided to consider the bid as Technically responsive.

6. The details of Technical Capacity, Financial Capacity and the Bid Capacity of the above bidders are as Annexure –I.

7. The **Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** in its 2nd meeting has discussed the evaluation 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 Dagmo Riba	**Technically non Responsive**	0
2	M/s Ganpati Builders	**Technically non Responsive**	0

3	M/s Jony Enterprises	**Technically non Responsive**	0
4	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	Technically Responsive	0
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	Technically Responsive	0
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	Technically Responsive	0
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	Technically Responsive	0
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	Nagaland -1 (OIA) Andaman and Nicobar - 1 (Kaba)
9	M/s PK & Company	Technically Responsive	0
10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises	Technically Responsive	0
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive	0
12	M/s Salo Enterprises	Technically Responsive	0
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	Arunachal Pradesh 1
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	Technically Responsive	0
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	**Technically non Responsive**	0
16	M/s LG Chaudhary	Technically Responsive	Sikkim -1
17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Technically Responsive	0
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	Technically Responsive	0
19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	Technically Responsive	0
20	M/s Buru Enterprise	Technically Responsive	0

8. The Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) recommends to open the financial bid of the 16 (Sixteen) technically responsive bidders after the approval of Competent Authority.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to chair.

Ajay Ahulwalia
(ED-I)
Chairman

B. Shivprasad
(GM-Tech)
Member

A.K. Jha
(GM-Tech)
Member

Bhaskar Mallick
Manager -Fin.
Member

Annexure - I

Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Minimum Technical threshold capacity (Clause 2.2.2.2 (i)=Rs. 59.00 Cr.	Similar work from category 1 & 3 in a single complete projects (Clause-2.2.2.2(ii) = Rs. 17.70 Cr.	Lead Member share (at least 60 % of total threshold technical capacity) i.e. Rs. 35.40 Cr.	Other Member Share (at least 20% of total threshold capacity) i.e. Rs. 11.80 Cr.
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	44.17 Cr	No (Rs 0 Cr)	NA	NA
2	M/s Ganpati Builders	109.40 Cr	Yes (Rs 25.69 Cr)	NA	NA
3	M/s Jony Enterprises	62.30 Cr	Yes (Rs 24.31 Cr)	NA	NA
4	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	85.73 Cr	Yes (Rs 69.22Cr)	NA	NA
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	87.95 Cr	Yes (Rs 20.37)	NA	NA
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	118.28 Cr	Yes (Rs 19.22)	NA	NA
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	65.95 Cr	Yes (32.67 Cr)	NA	NA
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	NA	Yes (28.67 Cr)	319.44 Cr	48.58 Cr
9	M/s PK & Company	104.79 Cr	Yes (35.81 Cr)	NA	NA
10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises	NA	Yes (334.88 Cr)	675.04 Cr	43.60 Cr
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	NA	Yes (53.55 Cr)	267.24 Cr	67.11 Cr
12	M/s Salo Enterprises	91.18 Cr	Yes (26.07 Cr)	NA	NA
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	301.20 Cr	Yes (63.37 Cr)	NA	NA
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	252.54 Cr	Yes (54.71 Cr)	NA	NA
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	657.36 Cr	Yes (0 Cr)	NA	NA
16	M/s LG Chaudhary	82.11 Cr	Yes (39.78 Cr)	NA	NA
17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	124.09 Cr	Yes (45.16 Cr)	NA	NA
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	80.96 Cr	Yes (19.56 Cr)	NA	NA

19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	75.03 Cr	Yes (21.17 Cr)	NA	NA
20	M/s Buru Enterprise	120.94 Cr	Yes (32.14 Cr)	NA	NA

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 5.90 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 17.70 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
1.	M/s Dagmo Riba	SE	-	8.81 Cr	65.58 Cr	Y
2.	M/s Ganpati Builders	SE	-	**0 Cr**	35.35 Cr	N
3.	M/s Jony Enterprises	SE	-	**4.55** Cr	**17.54** Cr	N
4.	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	SE	-	6.74 Cr	23.51 Cr	Y
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	SE	-	20.40 Cr	47.29 Cr	Y
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	SE	-	16.97 Cr	71.80 Cr	Y
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	SE	-	8.73 Cr	21.41 Cr	Y
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	JV	60-40	Lead - 149.76 Cr Other -4.87 Cr	Lead - 117.28 Cr Other -14.44 Cr	Y
9	M/s PK & Company	SE	-	15.77 Cr	21.14 Cr	Y
10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises	JV	60-40	Lead - 229.85 Cr Other -11.44 Cr	Lead - 158.79 Cr Other -36.17 Cr	Y

Summary of Financial Evaluation						
Sr. No.	Bidder Name	Role Details	Equity Holding	Claimed Net Worth (in INR 5.90 Crores)	Turnover (in INR 17.70 Crores)	Whether meeting the Financial Threshold Requirement
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	JV	51-49	Lead - 46.84 Cr Other -5.77 Cr	Lead - 90.15 Cr Other -33.16 Cr	Y
12	M/s Salo Enterprise	SE	-	23.11 Cr	33.45 Cr	Y
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	94.61 Cr	159.81 Cr	Y
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	SE	-	47.21 Cr	80.60 Cr	Y
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	SE	-	**0 Cr**	**0 Cr**	N
16	M/s LG Chaudhary	SE	-	25.26 Cr	137.68 Cr	Y
17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	SE	-	20.84 Cr	50.92 Cr	Y
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	SE	-	7.61 Cr	22.75 Cr	Y
19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	SE	-	6.34 Cr	21.66 Cr	Y
20	M/s Buru Enterprise	SE	-	34.25 Cr	60.00 Cr	Y

Statement of Bid Capacity Assessment									
Minimum Requirement of Bid Capacity = Rs. 59.00 Crore									
S No	Name of the Applicant	Calculated / Assessed							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.)	
1	M/s Dagmo Riba	2018-19	1.05	63.01	66.16	1.5	2.98	**245.12**	Yes
2	M/s Ganpati Builders	2016-17	1.15	17.31	19.98	1.5	43.76	**31.15**	No
3	M/s Jony Enterprises	2019-20	1.0	42.90	42.90	1.5	0	**160.88**	Yes
4	M/s Kampung Kamyer Trading Co.	2017-18	1.10	23.456	25.81	1.5	5.99	**90.78**	Yes
5	M/s Sri Kaushal Sharma	2018-19	1.05	79.88	83.87	1.5	105.51	**209.02**	Yes
6	M/s M V V Satyanaryana	2017-18	1.10	74.06	81.47	1.5	169.51	**135.99**	Yes
7	M/s Md. Matlebuddin Ahmed	2019-20	1.00	38.9	38.9	1.5	35.04	**110.84**	Yes
8	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.								
	M/s Overseas Infrastructure Alliance (India) Pvt. Ltd.	2015-16	1.2	174.66	209.59	1.5	532.72	**253.25**	Yes

	M/s Kaba Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	2019-20	1	27.47	27.47	1.5	74.11	**28.90**	Yes
							Total	**282.15**	Yes
9	M/s PK & Company	2017-18	1.10	36.54	40.19	1.5	42.84	**107.89**	Yes
10	M/s Puna Hinda JV M/s N.M Enterprises								
	M/s Puna Hinda	2019-20	1	186.72	186.72	1.5	0	**700.20**	Yes
	M/s N.M Enterprises	2016-17	1.15	65.25	75.04	1.5	0	**281.39**	Yes
							Total	**981.59**	Yes
11	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. JV M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd								
	M/s Rachna Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd	2019-20	1	132.48	132.48	1.5	63.28	**433.52**	Yes
	M/s Archon Powerinfra India Pvt. Ltd	2016-17	1.15	33.02	37.97	1.5	31.49	**110.91**	Yes
							Total	**544.43**	Yes
12	M/s Salo Enterprises	2019-20	1	43.64	43.64	1.5	0	163.65	Yes
13	M/s Shivam Transcon Pvt. Ltd.	2016-17	1.15	157.37	180.98	1.5	95.53	**583.13**	Yes
14	M/s Shree hari Associates Pvt. Ltd	2019-20	1	99.41	99.41	1.5	117.82	**254.97**	Yes
15	M/s Supreme Infrastructure India Limited	-	0	0	0	1.5	0	**0**	No
16	M/s LG Chaudhary	2018-19	1.05	175.11	183.87	1.5	159.45	**530.05**	Yes

17	M/s Divya Simandhar Construction Pvt. Ltd.	2017-18	1.1	71.7	78.87	1.5	48.73	**247.03**	Yes
18	M/s Sri Harsha Constructions	2018-19	1.05	30.48	32.00	1.5	21.77	**98.25**	Yes
19	M/s Mohinder Singh Contractor	2016-17	1.15	29.88	34.36	1.5	0	**128.86**	Yes
20	M/s Buru Enterprise	2017-18	1.10	78.35	86.19	1.5	0	**323.19**	Yes