

Project: Construction of Four-lane "Spur of Meerut- Garhmukteshwar section of NH-709A connecting NH-119 (New NH-34) near village Salarpur Jalalpur (Meerut) to NH-58 (New NH-334) near village Daurala, (Meerut) Bypassing Meerut city" (Design Km 00+000 to Design Km 12+828) under Bharatmala Pariyojna in the state of Uttar Pradesh" on EPC mode (**Tender ID : 2021_NHAI_90708_1**)

25.02.2022

Result of Technical Evaluation

S. No	Bid No.	Name of the Bidder	Technical Capacity		Financial Capacity		Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 300.05 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr)	Remarks
			Experience Score Assessed (Required = Rs. 300.05 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)	Whether Bidder meets 20% of EPC (i.e. Rs. 60.01 Cr) required in category 1 & 3 project (Rs. in Cr)	Net Worth Assessed (Required = Rs. 15.00 Cr.) (Rs. in Cr)	Average Annual Turnover (Required Rs. 45.01 Cr) (Rs. in Cr)		
1.	4/10	Dev Yash – RSCPL (JV)						Qualified
		Dev Yash Projects & Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	259.59	Updated EPC: 194.92	22.57	134.77	761.80	
		Raj Shyama Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	1,094.50		159.13	336.49	945.19	
		Total	1,354.09		181.70	471.26	1,706.99	
2.	5/10	JSC – CPA JV						Qualified subject to submission of proof for depositing tender fee.
		Joint Stock Company Buer (JSC)	2,200.77	Updated EPC: 215.00	60.49	570.80	1,630.02	
		C P Arora Engineers-Contractors Pvt. Ltd. (CPA)	273.67		20.79	84.22	952.35	
		Total	2,474.77		81.27	655.02	2,582.37	
3.	6/10	SRSC Infra Private Limited	450.04	Updated EPC: 89.49	22.20	158.86	745.42	Qualified
4.	7/10	D P Jain & Co. Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	2,235.20	Updated EPC: 243.61	279.08	517.27	469.39	Qualified
5.	9/10	S.S Builders	347.59	Updated EPC: 79.81	24.76	95.35	378.90	Qualified
6.	10/10	PBC Infra Prabhunath JV						Qualified
		M/s Prabhunath Prasad Thekedar	212.71	Updated EPC: 67.78	13.28	64.31	636.38	
		PBC Infrastructure India Pvt. Ltd.-	194.90		18.38	53.80	551.63	
		Total	407.61		31.66	118.11	1,188.01	

S. No.	Bid No.	Name of the Bidder	Technical Capacity		Financial Capacity		Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 300.05 Cr.)	Remarks
			Experience Score Assessed (Required = Rs. 300.05 Cr)	Whether Bidder meets 20% of EPC (i.e. Rs. 60.01 Cr) required in category 1 & 3 project	Net Worth Assessed (Required = Rs. 15.00 Cr.)	Average Annual Turnover (Required Rs. 45.01 Cr)		
			(Rs. in Cr)	(Rs. in Cr)	(Rs. in Cr)	(Rs. in Cr)	(Rs. in Cr)	
7.	1/10	Maruti Infracreation Pvt. Ltd.	237.10*	Updated EPC: 71.10	45.08	207.50	911.21	Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid.
8.	2/10	Jainco Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. - Ajay Prakash Associates (JV)						Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid.
		Jainco Enterprises Pvt. Ltd	307.04	Updated EPC: 126.66	52.66	68.25	182.90	
		M/s Ajay Prakash Associates	134.43		13.45	82.18	569.33	
		Total	441.47		66.11	150.43	752.23	
9.	3/10	M/s Sarvodya Infracon Private Limited	196.85*		16.60	124.50	741.46	Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid.
10.	8/10	Sh Pawan Kumar	264.82*	Updated EPC: 139.77	23.10	126.70	640.92	Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid.

Reasons for non-eligibility of the Bidders

Note-1: Maruti Infracreation Pvt. Ltd.: Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid, on account of reasons furnished below:

- In case of Project code (c), Bidder has claimed the payments receipts after applying updation factor. However, the payment received in preceding 5 financial years before applying updation factors is less than 5% (i.e. Rs. 15.00 Crore) of the EPC. Therefore, as per clause 2.2.2.6(ii) read along with clause 2.2.2.2 of RFP, the said project is not qualified as an Eligible Project. Hence, the same has not been considered under evaluation.
- In case of Project code (i), Bidder in its replies is claiming to consider the said project in category 4 as new roads have also been constructed in addition to the resurfacing of existing roads and has submitted the Bill of Quantity as supporting document. However, from the available documents it is not reflected that the project has been executed for construction of new roads and as per clause 2.2.2.5(iii)(II) of RFP resurfacing works are not considered as eligible project. Hence, the same has been considered under evaluation.

Hence, the Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility criteria as specified in clause 2.2.2.2(i) of RFP.

Note-2: Jainco Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. - Ajay Prakash Associates (JV): Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid, on account of reasons furnished below:

- As per clause 2.14.1.1 of RFP, in case of JV the DSC should be in the name of Authorized Signatory of Lead Member, which is reproduced below for your ready reference:

It is mandatory for all the Bidders to have class-III Digital Signature Certificate (DSC)(in the name of Authorized Signatory / Firm or Organisation / Owner of the Firm or Organisation) from any of the licensed Certifying Agency (Bidders can see the list of licensed CAs from the link www.cca.gov.in) to participate in e-tendering of NHAI.

*DSC should be in the name of the authorized signatory as authorized in Appendix III of this RFP or person executing/delegating such Appendix III in favour of Authorized Signatory. **It should be in corporate capacity** (that is in Bidder capacity / **in case of JV in the Lead Member capacity**, as applicable). The Bidder shall submit document in support of the class III DSC. In other cases, the bid shall be considered Non-responsive.*

However, as the same has been submitted in the name of Authorized Signatory i.e. Mr. Ajay Prakash Gupta of Other Member instead of Lead Member.

- As per clause 2.1.6 of RFP, in case the Bidder is a Joint Venture, the Members thereof should upload Power of Attorney in favour of the Lead Member in the format at Appendix-IV and Joint Bidding Agreement in the format at Appendix-V. Please refer clause 2.1.6 of RFP reproduced below herein:

In case the Bidder is a Joint Venture, the Members thereof should upload Power of Attorney in favour of the Lead Member in the format at Appendix-IV and Joint Bidding Agreement in the format at Appendix-V. Lowest Bidder shall be required to submit original Power of Attorney in favour of the Lead Member and original Joint Bidding Agreement before issuance of Letter of Acceptance (LOA) by the Authority

However, the Bidder has submitted the Power of Attorney in the format of Appendix-IV in favor of Other Member instead of Lead Member. Hence, the POA for Lead Member is not for the Lead Member of the JV, which is not acceptable.

Therefore, in view of the above facts, the Bidder is declared Non-responsive.

Note-3: Sarvodya Infracon Private Limited: Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid, on account of reasons furnished below:

- On the basis of available documents, project code (i) to (z) claimed by the Bidder in support of Technical Capacity is having payment receipts less than 5% (i.e. Rs. 15.00 crore) of EPC which may not be considered under eligible project as per clause 2.2.2.6 (ii) read along with clause 2.2.2.2 of RFP. Consequently, the aggregate technical score of the bidder is coming out to be less than the minimum requirement of technical capacity of Rs. 300.05 Crore as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP.

Therefore, the Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility criteria specified in clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP.

- Bidder has claimed project code “a” for single completed work. However, as per Client’s certificate available in the bid document, the said project is completed on 14.08.2021, which is prior to the last five financial years preceding the Bid Due Date. Further, none of the other projects eligible in Category 3 is having Estimated Project Cost of Rs. 60.01 Crore.

Therefore, the Bidder also fails to meet eligibility criteria as specified in Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) of RFP, i.e. one similar work of 20% of Estimated Project Cost shall have been completed or substantially completed (i.e. where more than 90% value of work have been completed) over the last 5 Financial Years i.e. up to 31-03-2021 from the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3.

Note-4: Sh Pawan Kumar: Not eligible for opening of Financial Bid, on account of reasons furnished below:

- In case of project code ‘a’, namely, “IMT Rohtak Phase-III project of HSIIDC”, the Bidder has claimed that the said project is a state highway project connected to the national highway and has submitted various supporting documents such as completion certificate, performance report, Work Order etc. in support of the project. However, from the available documents, it is not reflected that the project is a state highway project and connected to a national highway and the same is not considered under Category 3.

Further, in project code ‘d’, the Bidder has mentioned payment received 2013-2016 however, year wise payment received details is not clearly reflected. Further, the eligible financial year to be considered for evaluation is from 2016-17 to 2020-21, therefore, the period 2013-16 cannot be considered. Hence, the same has not been considered.

Furthermore, in project code e, the Bidder has claimed the project under category 4 however, repair and maintenance work not considered as per clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) (b) (II) of RFP. Hence, the same has not been considered.

In view of the above, the aggregate technical score of the bidder is coming out to be less than the minimum requirement of technical capacity of Rs. 300.05 Crore as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP.

Therefore, the Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility criteria specified in clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP.