



NHAI/BM/DAExpressway/2021/Pkg XIV/IE

Dated: 29.03.2022

To
All Bidders

Subject: Independent Engineer services for Supervision of Construction of four/six-lane access-controlled expressway from Junction with Pathankot-Gurdaspur road (NH-54) near Balsua to Junction with Hiranagar Road near village Gurha Baildaran (km 423+500 to km 468+100) of Delhi Amritsar Katra Expressway on HAM mode under Bharatmala Pariyojna in the state of Punjab and UT of J&K (Phase II-Package XIV) - Result of Evaluation of Technical Proposal and opening of Financial Proposals regd.

This is with reference to NHAI letter dated 09.03.2022 vide which result of Technical Evaluation was uploaded on NIC Portal and bidders were given opportunity to respond, in case of any objection.

2. The representation had been received from the below-mentioned bidders:

S. No.	Name of the Bidders
1	M/s Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd in Association with M/s Ishita Info Solutions Pvt. Ltd.
2	M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation.
3	M/s Geo Designs & Research Pvt. Ltd. In JV with M/s Hexa Co. in association with M/s Sai Geotechnical Lab.

3. The representations as received have been examined and replies to the representation as approved by the Competent Authority is enclosed.

4. It has been observed that in the bid submitted by the firm M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation, the JV partner of the firm **M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc.** has not submitted any details regarding Technical Capacity of the firm in Appendix B-11 format as prescribed in clause 15 (c) and Section 4 of the RFP in the originally submitted bid documents. The technical capacity on behalf of the JV was also not enclosed. Earlier, inadvertently, the bid of the firm was evaluated and marks were assigned. In view of above, as no details regarding the Technical Capacity was submitted by the JV partner/on behalf of JV in the original bid documents, the bid submitted by the firm **M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation is declared as Non-Responsive** as per clause 3.1 of section 2 LOI of RFP. Based on the above, the final technical evaluation marks obtained by firms is indicated as below:

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Relevant experience for the assignment	Experience in use of technology for road inspection	Qualifications and competence of the key staff for the assignment	Total marks
Responsive firms					
1	M/s Consulting Engineers Group Ltd. in association with M/s MaRs Planning and Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd.	38.00	20.00	35.87	93.87

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Relevant experience for the assignment	Experience in use of technology for road inspection	Qualifications and competence of the key staff for the assignment	Total marks
2	M/s FP India Project Management Consultancy Services Pvt. Ltd. in association with M/s Indian Engineering Consultants India Pvt. Ltd.	37.75	20.00	35.86	93.61
Non Responsive Firms					
3	M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation.	Details regarding Technical capacity of JV partner and on behalf of JV not enclosed in the originally submitted bid documents			
4	M/s Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd in Association with M/s Ishita Info Solutions Pvt. Ltd.	The replacement of Key Personnel would be more than 50%.			
5	M/s Geo Designs & Research Pvt. Ltd. In JV with M/s Hexa Co. in association with M/s	M/s Geo Designs & Research Pvt. Ltd. fails in meeting the minimum eligibility criteria of preparation of DPR as well as project supervision/ IC of project length for which RFP is invited as per provisions of RFP.			

5. The financial bids of the above mentioned two Technically Responsive bidders will be opened on 30.03.2022 at 1100 hrs in the IT Training Room, Ground Floor at NHAI, Head Quarter.


 (Shashi Bhushan)
 General Manager (Tech)
 Bharatmala Division

Encl : As above

Reply to Representation of bidders for “Independent Engineer services for Supervision of Construction of four/six-lane access-controlled expressway from Junction with Pathankot-Gurdaspur road (NH-54) near Balsua to Junction with Hiranagar Road near village Gurha Baildaran (km 423+500 to km 468+100) of Delhi Amritsar Katra Expressway on HAM mode under Bharatmala Pariyojna in the state of Punjab and UT of J&K (Phase II-Package XIV)”

S. No.	Representation		Reply of NHAI
M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation.			
1	3.1 Team Leader cum Senior Highway Engineer- Mr. Satish Kaul 2 a) iii) Experience as Team Leader or similar capacity in Highway Development projects (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) on PPP 1 projects -4 marks add 1 mark extra for additional projects subject to maximum 1(one) marks	Mr. Satish Kaul has experience of 2 nos. of Projects in similar capacity in Highway Development projects (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) on PPP Therefore Mr. Kaul should be given 5 marks instead of 4 marks for this sub-criterion as it is given in the evaluation sheet.	The bid submitted by the firm has been reviewed and it has been observed that the JV partner of the firm M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. has not submitted any details regarding Technical Capacity of the firm in Appendix B-11 format as prescribed in clause 15 (c) and Section 4 of the RFP in the originally submitted bid documents. The technical capacity on behalf of the JV was also not enclosed. Earlier, inadvertently, the bid of the firm was evaluated and marks were assigned. In view of above, as no details regarding the Technical Capacity was submitted by the JV partner/ on behalf of JV in the original bid documents, the bid submitted by the firm M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s ALTINOK Consulting Engineering Inc. in association with M/s Upham International Corporation is declared as Non-Responsive as per clause 3.1 of section 2 LOI of RFP.
2	2 b) Experience as Team Leader or similar capacity of project Preparation including design of major highway Project (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above). < 2 projects -0 2 Projects -11 Add 2 marks for each additional project subject to maximum 4 marks.	Mr. Satish Kaul has experience of 6 nos. of Projects in similar capacity of project Preparation including design of major highway Project (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) as per details. Therefore Mr. Kaul should be given 15 marks instead of 4 marks for this sub-criterion as it is given in the evaluation sheet.	
3	2 c) Experience in position of Team Leader/Project Manager or similar capacity in Construction Supervision/IC involving length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6** laning) and above < 2 projects - 0 2 Projects - 16 Add 2 marks extra for each additional project subject to maximum 4 (four) marks	Mr. Satish Kaul has experience of 7 nos. of Projects in similar capacity of Construction Supervision/IC involving length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6** laning) and above as per details Therefore marks given for this criteria to Mr. Kaul should be reviewed and he should be given 20 marks instead of 18 marks for this sub-criteria as it is given in the technical evaluation and he should be given total 91 marks instead of 84 marks as it is given in the Technical Evaluation	

S. No.	Representation		Reply of NHAI
4	3.3 Bridge/Structural Engineer- Mr. Sujeet Kumar 2 iii) Experience in similar capacity in supervision of Major Highway Bridges/ROB/Flyover/ Interchanges/ any other structures < 2 Bridges -0 02 Bridge -16 Add 2 mark extra for each additional bridge subject to maximum 4 marks	Mr. Kumar has experience of 11 nos. of Bridges in supervision of Major Highway Bridges/ROB/Flyover/ Interchanges/ any other structures as per details Therefore Mr. Kumar should be given 20 marks instead of 18 marks for this sub-criterion as it is given in the evaluation sheet	
5	2. iv) Experience in similar capacity in supervision of Rehabilitation and repair of Major Bridges/ ROB/Flyover/ Interchanges/ any other structures < 2 - 0 2 nos. -07 3 or more -10	Mr. Kumar has experience of 3 nos. of Bridges in supervision of Rehabilitation and repair of Major Bridges/ ROB/Flyover/ Interchanges/ any other structures as per details Therefore Mr. Kumar should be given 10 marks instead of 0 marks for this sub-criterion as it is given in the evaluation sheet	
6	2 v) Experience in similar capacity of modern bridge construction technology viz., Precast Segmental, Balanced Cantilever Construction, Extradosed Bridge, Full Span Launching, Incremental Launching. Experience in 1 project - 4 More than one project - 5 marks	Mr. Kumar has experience of 5 nos. of projects in similar capacity of modern bridge construction technology viz., Precast Segmental, Balanced Cantilever Construction, Extradosed Bridge, Full Span Launching, Incremental Launching as per details mentioned below: Therefore marks given for this criteria to Mr. Kumar should be reviewed and he should be given 5 marks instead of 0 marks for this sub-criteria as it is given in the technical evaluation and he should be given total 91 marks instead of 74 marks as it is given in the Technical Evaluation.	
7	3.4 Senior Pavement Specialist -Raja Rajeshwaran iv) Experience in similar capacity on major Highway projects (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) in innovative/non traditional technology and design 1 Project -4	Mr. Rajeshwaran has experience of two projects in similar capacity on major Highway projects (of length 40% of project length or more of similar configuration (2/4/6 laning**) and above) in innovative/non traditional technology and design as per details Therefore marks given for this criteria to Mr. Rajeshwaran should be reviewed and he should be	

S. No.	Representation		Reply of NHAI
	2 or more -5	given 5 marks instead of 0 marks for this sub-criteria as it is given in the technical evaluation and he should be given total 84 marks instead of 79 marks as it is given in the Technical Evaluation.	
M/s Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd in Association with M/s Ishita Info Solutions Pvt. Ltd			
8	We are in receipt of your letter vide which it is informed that we have been declared non responsive on following grounds:- 1. It has been noted that as per NHAI letter no. NHAI/HAM/Sethiya-Chola/2021/49182 dt. 02.03.2022 M/s. Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd. has been restrained from participating in any NHAI bids (directly or in Association / JV) with immediate effect and until further order. In this matter, kindly take into consideration that the said impugned order of NHAI has been set aside by the Hon'ble Delhi High court in consideration of our Writ Petition No. 3969/2022 in its order dated 14.03.2022. Copy of order of Hon'ble Delhi High court is enclosed with this letter for your kind Consideration.		The representation submitted by the bidder has been discussed and it has been noted that the firm M/s Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd in Association with M/s Ishita Info Solutions Pvt. Ltd. has been recently awarded the Independent Engineer Services Work of Delhi Amritsar Katra Expressway (Package 16), Contract Agreement signed on 03.02.2022 and is also First Rank Applicant for IE Work of Delhi Amritsar Katra Expressway (Package 15) in Bharatmala Division. As out of the 6 Nos. of Key Personnel proposed by the firm in the instant proposal, 5 Nos. of key personnel are common to Key Personnel in the aforesaid mentioned two projects (IE for Delhi Amritsar Katra Expressway Package 15 & 16). In this regard, it is to mention that as the Clause 1.10 of Section 2 of the RFP, Replacement of Key Personnel upto a maximum of 50% of the total Key Personnel is permitted for the bidder. Also, as per Clause 4.5.2 of the GCC of the Draft Contract Agreement stipulates about substitution of Key Personnel limited to not more than 3 Nos., subject to equally or better qualified. In view of the above, the representation has not been considered and firm remains as technically non-responsive as declared earlier.
9	Out of 6 Key personnel in subject bid, 5 are common in awarded project of package 15 & 16 to M/s. Theme Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd. In this matter kindly appreciate that:- As desired by NHAI, we hereby extend the validity of our proposal and submit CVs for replacement of a few key experts as per Clause 1.10 of Lol of RFP. As the Clause 1.10 of LOI of RFP permits us to replace 3 Key Experts without any reduction in remuneration and we have		

S. No.	Representation	Reply of NHAI
	requested for these while extending the bid validity. Clause 4.5 of GCC will further allow the consultant to replace other 3 experts with reduction in remuneration. Thus, we are in a position to fulfill the conditions of RFP and work in case if the project is awarded to us. Moreover, clause 3.4 (xi) of LOI of RFP states that the consultant can replace as many experts who are debarred by NHAI/MoRT&H after submission of the bids and these replacements will be considered on part of NHAI. Here the debarment is having some effective meaning as both, if happened in one project, would make the expert unavailable for the subsequent project. The Infracon policy for blocking of CVs of experts also states so to avoid selection of an expert in multiple assignments at given point of time. Therefore, as explained above kindly consider our bids and give due score 97.04 (detailed in Annexure 2) to us for the sake of healthy competition and the justice please.	
M/s Geo Designs & Research Pvt. Ltd. In JV with M/s Hexa Co. in association with M/s Sai Geotechnical Lab		
10	Annexure (A-1) The firm should have minimum experience of Project Supervision/IC of 2/4/6**-laning project of aggregate length equal to 3 times or more of similar category for which RFP is invited.	1. Supervision for Construction of (1) Four Lanning of Vadodara-Dabhoi road km 07/00 to km 31/0 works on SH No.-11 & (2) Four Lanning of Vadodara-Savli road km 18/0 to km 32/4 works on SH No.-158 falling under Vadodara Districts.. Length.: 38.40 Km Page No.: 319 to 320 2. Supervision consultancy services for the construction of "Bedi Maliasan Ring Road and The project having quality checking/technical audit, quality assurance and day to day supervision type works, safety audit works, landscaping works etc. have not been considered as similar category supervision works. Further, the two laning projects having cost less than Rs. 3 Crore and non-highway projects has not been considered for evaluation. In view of the above and the representation submitted, the bid has been reviewed and it has been

S. No.	Representation	Reply of NHAI
	Rajkot Bhavnagar Four Lanning under District R & B Division Rajkot in the State of Gujarat. (Total length of Four Lane= 53.30 kms). Length.:53.30 Km Page no.: 321 to 322 3. Consultancy services for Authority's Engineer for supervision of Project of Construction of four lane road of Danta-Ambaji Km 90/000 to 112/510 Dist: Banaskantha (SH-56). Length.:22.510 Km Page No.: 323 to 325 4. Consultancy Services of Project Supervision on day to day basis for the work of Four Lanning of Surat-Olpad- Sahol Road km. 9/8 to 29/2. Length.: 19.4 Km Page No. 343 to 345 5. Consultancy Services for Project Supervision of (1) Four laning of Halol - Manchi - Road Km. 0/0 to 2/7 (Halol Diversion - 2) in SH-5. (2) Four laning of Bodeli - Halol Road Km. 329/5 to 336/0 in SH-5. (3) Four laning of Pavagadh Hill Road Km. 0/0 to 5/2 in SH-5A. and carrying out the safety audit as per IRC MORTH guidelines for the roads falling under Panchmahal & Dahod District. Length.: 9.20 Km Page No.: 346 to 347 6. Project Supervision for Improvement of various roads in Daman District: (1) Nani Daman to Dabhel Check post (2) Kadiaya School to Bhimpore char rasta (3) Patlara Junction to Kachhigam Char Rasta (4) Patalia to Bamanpuja Gate Roads.(Sole Bidder) (GDRPL) Length.: 17 Km Page No.: 348 to 349 7. Providing Consultancy Service for Project Supervision of Widening and strengthening of roads including up gradation of strom water drains and landscaping works Silvasa naroli road.	noted that that Lead Partner fails in meeting the minimum eligibility criteria of Project Supervision as per RFP. Hence, the bid submitted by the firm remains as non-responsive as declared earlier.

S. No.	Representation	Reply of NHAI
	(Sole Bidder) (GDRPL) Length.: 9.97 Km Page No.: 350 to 352 There are 07 Nos of project attached in our submission having aggregate length more than three times of the project length i.e 169.78- 2/4/6 Lane (Which is more than 50% of Three times of Project Length i.e. 66.9 Km for Lead Member). Again, Project No 1,2,3,4 mentioned in above table which has length greater than 17.84 (Which is 40% of Project Length).	
11	The firm should have minimum experience of preparation of detailed Project Report/ Feasibility Study cum Preliminary Design Report of 2/4/6** -laning project of aggregate length equal to 2 times or more of similar category for which RFP is invited. 1.Consultancy Services for carrying feasibility study Detailed Survey/Investigation, Alignment Option, Preparation of General arrangement Drawing Engineering Report for Development of NH No. 8C (New NH No. 147) passing through Chiloda-Gandhinagar-Sarkhej road Km. 0/0 to 44/420 including ROB, Flyover, Under Pass, Widening with service road, VUP, PUP and junction development for / upto 6 lanning or as per instruction / requirement under N.H. Division, Ahmedabad in the state of Gujarat. Length.: 44.420 Km Page No.: 581 to 583 2. Consultancy Services for Preparation of Detailed Project Report of selected stretches/corridors of National Highway-848 between Km. 0/00 to 37/400 (Pardi NH-48 Junction - Sukesh - Nanaponda - Kaprada Section) in the State of Gujarat for up gradation to Two lane with paved shoulder configuration. Length.: 38.074 Km Page No.: 584 to 585	The project mentions at page 584 to 585 of the bid documents has been named as a two lane with paved shoulder configuration project and in details it has been shown as proposed 4 lane configuration. Further, as per the certificate enclosed at page 585, the project duration has been shown as 2.5 months, while in the certification from the bidder at page 584, it has been shown as having duration of more than five months. In view of the above and the representation submitted, the bid has been reviewed and it has been noted that that Lead Partner fails in meeting the minimum eligibility criteria of preparation of DPR as per RFP. Hence, the bid submitted by the firm remains as non-responsive as declared earlier.