



भारतीय राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग प्राधिकरण NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

(सड़क परिवहन एवं राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार)

(MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS, GOVT. OF INDIA)

क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय: नागसंद्रा मेट्रो स्टेशन के पीछे, बेंगलूरु-५६० ०७३.

Regional Office: Beside Nagasandra Metro Station, Bengaluru - 560073.

Email : robangalore@nhai.org | ronhaibangalore@gamil.com

Phone : 080-28397156, 28397171, Fax : 080-28377171



No.NHAI/RO-BNG/11019/Tender/2022/4613

Date: 02.03.2022

To,
All participated Bidders,

Sub: Construction of LVUP at Nangali cross @ CH.220+770 and provision of PUP @ Ch:220+380 in the approach portion of Black spot (KA-02-186) under road safety for rectification of blackspots in the stretch of Mulbagal-AP/KNT Border Section of NH-75 (old No. NH-4) from Km.216+912 to Km.239+100 in the State of Karnataka under EPC mode - **Outcome of Technical Evaluation of Bids (Stage-1) - reg.**

Ref: NIT No.24/NHAI/RO-BNG/11019/Tender/2021-22 dated 15.09.2021

Sir,

The bids were received (online) for the subject work on 20.10.2021 till 1500 Hrs. Bids were opened on 21.10.2021 at Regional Office, Bengaluru. The outcome of Technical / Stage-I evaluation is enclosed as **Annexure-I**.

2. Bidders are requested to submit their objections, if any, within 07 days of receipt of this letter. The date of opening of financial bids will be conveyed in due course of time.

3. This issues with the approval of CGM (Tech) / RO - Bengaluru.

Yours faithfully,


(Vutla Padmaja)
Manager (Tech)

Regional Office - Bengaluru

Technical Evaluation Result (Stage-I)

NIT-24

Sr. No.	Name of the Bidder	Technical Capacity		Financial Capacity		Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 21.28 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr.)	Remarks
		Experience Score Assessed (Required = Rs. 15.96 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)	Whether Bidder meets 25% of EPC (i.e. Rs. 12.06 Cr.) required in category 1 & 3 project (Rs. in Cr)	Net Worth Assessed (Required = Rs. 1.06 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr)	Average Annual Turnover (Required Rs. 4.25 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr.)		
1	M/s A. Balarama Reddy	191.42	Yes, Refer project code 'E'	0.22	87.42	298.83	Not Qualified. Refer Note-1 Below
2	M/s Ammapur Infrastructure (P) Ltd.	244.31	Updated EPC: 46.29 Yes, Refer project code 'A'	3.39	55.81	33.33	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid
3	M/s Arjunvaishnavi Infrastructure & Developers (P) Ltd.	0.00	NO	2.76	7.12	86.16	Not Qualified. Refer Note-2 Below
4	M/s Krishi Inftratech	111.71	Yes, Refer project code 'A'	38.39	204.76	90.44	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid
5	M/s M.G. Arunkumar	79.83	Updated EPC: 56.31 Yes, Refer project code 'E'	9.68	34.17	23.42	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid
6	M/s RP Projects (P) Ltd.	12.65	Updated EPC: 18.64 Yes, Refer project code 'A'	3.79	10.61	58.70	Not Qualified. Refer Note-3 Below
7	M/s RPP Infra Projects Ltd.	174.62	Updated EPC: 12.25 Yes, Refer project code 'A'	261.17	546.94	210.80	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid
8	M/s Sree Bhramara Infrastructures (P) Ltd.	31.33	Updated EPC:138.19 Yes, Refer project code 'A'	9.37	17.40	79.12	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid
9	M/s Sri Sathya Ganapathi Constructions	28.22	Updated EPC: 27.15 Yes, Refer project code 'A'	3.23	23.24	0.00	Not Qualified. Refer Note-4 Below
10	M/s SVS Mookambika Constructions (P) Ltd.	191.63	Updated EPC: 13.95 Yes, Refer project code 'B'	27.62	83.24	51.39	Qualified for opening of Financial Bid

Note: 1: M/s A. Balarama Reddy

The Bidder was requested to furnish the detailed workings regarding the assessment of claimed personal networth of Rs. 26.87 Crore including the valuation reports of assets considered in personal networth. However, the bidder has not furnished any documentary evidence in this regard. Therefore, the networth of the bidder has been assessed based on the balance sheet as on 31.03.2020 submitted by the bidder. As per the submitted balance sheet, the net worth of the bidder is assessed as Rs. 22,17,696/- which is less than the required minimum networth of Rs. 1.06 crore. Therefore, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the requirement of clause 2.2.2.3 (i) of the RFP.

Note-2: M/s Arjunvaishnavi Infrastructure & Developers (P) Ltd.

The bidder was requested to clarify as to why the claimed projects (project Code "A" to "E") should be considered as Eligible Project pursuant to clause 2.2.2.5 (iii)(II). The bidder in its reply has stated that EPC works is considered for eligible projects. However, upon review of the submitted client certificate and statutory auditor's certificates, we are of view that the projects claimed by the bidder are of maintenance/periodical renewal by resurfacing which has been specifically excluded from definition of Eligible Projects pursuant to clause 2.2.2.5 (iii)(II). Further, from the submitted certificates it is not ascertainable that the projects are awarded to the bidder on EPC basis so as to consider such projects as Eligible. Therefore, the projects A to E have not been considered as eligible projects pursuant to clause 2.2.2.5 (iii)(II). Consequently, the assessed threshold technical capacity of the bidder has been assessed as Nil as against the minimum requirement of Rs. 15.96 crore. Therefore, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i).

The bidder was also requested to clarify the experience of having completed one similar work of Rs.12.06 Crore from the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 specified in Clause 2.2.2.5. The bidder in its response has submitted the following certificate from the Statutory Auditor:

Project Name: Periodic Renewal by Re-surfacing and other safety devices of Development of Adequate Road Connectivity to New Mangalore Port for the length of 25.472 Km of the Stretches at Km.358.000 to Km. 375.300 on NH-66 and Km. 328.000 to Km.338.000 on LHS and Km. 345.000 to Km. 346.000 on Bypass (from Padil Junction towards Maroli) Km 0.000 to Km. 2.172on Bypass (from Nanthoor junction towards Padil), of Development of Adequate Port Road connectivity to New MangalorePort in the State of Karnataka.

The submitted project is of Periodic Renewal by Re-surfacing which has been specifically excluded from definition of Eligible Projects pursuant to clause 2.2.2.5 (iii)(II). Therefore, the project has not been considered for the purpose of evaluation of one similar work. Thus, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii).

Note-3: M/s RP Projects (P) Ltd.

The bidder was requested to clarify as to why the project code B & C should be considered as Eligible Project for the purpose of assessment of Technical Capacity. The bidder in its reply has stated that the projects be considered under core sector (i.e. category-4) pursuant to clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) (b).

Clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) (b) of RFP defines the Core Sector projects which include "civil construction cost of power sector, commercial setups (SEZs etc.), airports, industrial parks/ estates, logistic parks, pipelines, irrigation, water supply, sewerage, irrigation, water supply, stadium, hospitals, hotel, smart city, warehouse/silos, oil & gas and real estate development".

Both the Projects bearing code B & C are pertain to "Manufacture, Supply, Fabrication and Erection of Chain link Fencing with MS angles, Barbed wire and providing basement with RR & Brick Masonry" and as such does not fall under the definition of core sector provided in clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) (b).

Therefore, the projects "B" & "C" are not considered as eligible projects for the purpose of evaluation of Technical Capacity and accordingly the Technical Capacity of the bidder has been assessed as Rs. 12.65 crore as against the minimum requirement of Rs. 15.96 Crore. Therefore, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting minimum threshold technical capacity under clause 2.2.2.2 (i).

Note 4: M/s Sri Sathya Ganapathi Constructions

The bidder was requested to clarify as to why the Statutory auditor's certificates certifying the Value of A and the table containing value of all the existing commitments and on-going works (Value of B), does not bear UDIN. The bidder in its reply did not furnish the revised certificates bearing UDIN.

Since the generation of UDIN is mandatory for the chartered accountants/statutory auditors for issuing any certificate. In the absence of UDIN, the authenticity of the submitted certificates is doubtful. For assessment of Value of A, we have relied on Annual accounts. However, in absence of UDIN on the statutory auditor's certificate for "Value of B", the authenticity of the certificate is doubtful. Accordingly, the value of B has not been assessed and consequently, the bid capacity has been assessed as nil. Therefore, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the minimum required Bid Capacity as per clause 2.2.2.1.

NIT-24