

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

16011/117/RO-VNS/UP(E)/2022/

Date: 31.05.2022

Sub.: Tender for "Construction of 211.880m Major Bridge on Well foundation over River Gomti on NH-128A (Parallel to Shastri Bridge) in Jaunpur City on Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) Mode in the State of Uttar Pradesh-(02nd Call)": Technical Evaluation of Bids-Reg.

Ref.: 1. Tender ID: 2022_NHAI_111835_1
2. PIU-Azamgarh Circular No. 6057 dated 07.05.2022
3. RO-UP(E), Technical note sheet dated 19.05.2022
4. PIU-Azamgarh Circular No. 6087 dated 19.05.2022
5. M/s Mittal Brothers Engineer and Contractor letter dated 20.05.2022
6. M/s Royal Infraconstru Ltd. letter dated 23.05.2022
7. PIU-Azamgarh letter No. 6091 dated 25.05.2022
8. PIU-Azamgarh letter No. 6092 dated 25.05.2022
9. PIU-Azamgarh letter No. 6093 dated 25.05.2022
10. PIU-Azamgarh letter No. 6094 dated 25.05.2022
11. M/s Mittal Brothers Engineer and Contractor letter dated 26.05.2022
12. M/s R K Constructions (INDIA) Pvt. Ltd. letter no. 406 dated 27.05.2022
13. M/s Brahma Constructions letter dated 30.05.2022
14. Border Roads Organization letter dated 30.05.2022
15. Bridge Corporation Unit, Gorakhpur letter no. 449 dated 28.05.2022
16. Bridge Corporation Unit, Azamgarh letter no. 252 dated 30.05.2022

The estimate for the subject work was approved by Competent Authority vide NHAI, HQ Letter No. 77 dated 12.10.2021 duly Authorizing RO-UP (East) to invite bid for execution of the subject work (copy enclosed).

Accordingly, RFP was approved by Competent Authority with Estimated Project Cost Rs 22.56 Cr vide E-Office Computer No. 140648 dated 30.03.2022 (copy enclosed) along-with following committee for opening and evaluation of the bids:

1. Sh. SP Pathak, GM (Tech.)/Project Director, PIU-Azamgarh.
2. Sh. C.M. Dwivedi, GM (Tech.)/Project Director, PIU-Gorakhpur
3. Sh. Abhishek, Manager (Tech.), RO-UP (East), Varanasi
4. Sh. Rajesh Kumar Paswan, JAO/(F&A Unit), RO-UP (East), Varanasi

The tender was uploaded on E-tender Portal with Tender ID: 2022_NHAI_111835_1 on 01.04.2022 with bid due date as 28.04.2022.

2. The technical bids were opened on 06.05.2022 (as per corrigendum dated 27.04.2022 extending bid due date as 05.05.2022) and total **Five** nos. of bids were received online. The details are as under:

Abhi

31/5/22

W

9

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

Sr. No.	Name of the Firms/Bidders
01.	M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers & Contractors
02.	M/s Brahma Construction
03.	M/s Royal Infra Construction Limited
04.	M/s RAC Developers Pvt. Ltd.
05.	M/s RK Constructions India Private Limited

3. The above bids were evaluated by the Evaluation Committee as per the criteria of the Bid Documents and documents received from the bidders. The committee found that, out of the Five (5) bidders, Four (4) bidders are substantially Technically Responsive to the requirements of the RFP. Accordingly, the committee recommended for approval of Technical evaluation as per below table, which was approved by the Competent Authority on 19.05.2022.

Sr. No.	Name of the Firms/Bidders	Status
01.	M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers & Contractors	Technically Qualified
02.	M/s Brahma Construction	Technically Qualified
03.	M/s Royal Infra Construction Limited	Technically Qualified
04.	M/s RAC Developers Pvt. Ltd.	Technically not Qualified
05.	M/s RK Constructions India Private Limited	Technically Qualified

The result of the technical evaluation was uploaded on the E-tender Portal as per the E-tendering guidelines for inviting objections (if any) within 07 days.

4. Subsequently, the representations were received in respect of certain bidders - M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers & Contractors and M/s Royal Infraconstru Ltd. vide letter dated 20.05.2022 and dated 23.05.2022 respectively.

Clarifications were obtained by PD, Azamgarh in writing vide letter no. 6094 dated 25.05.2022, letter no. 6093 dated 25.05.2022 and letter no. 6092 dated 25.05.2022.

Further, the concerned experience certificate issuing Authorities i.e. BRO in case of M/s Brahma Construction and UP Bridge Corporation, Azamgarh & Gorakhpur in case of M/s RK Constructions India Private Limited were also requested by PD PIU Azamgarh vide letters dated 25.05.2022 & 27.05.2022 respectively for verification of the details of the works executed as claimed by the respective bidders.

Replies were received from M/s Brahma Construction (letter no.L-03 dated 30.05.2022), M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers & Contractors (letter no. nil dated 26.05.2022) and M/s RK Constructions India Private Limited (letter no. 406 dated 27.05.2022) alongwith clarification received from BRO (letter dated

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature and date 31/05/22

Handwritten mark

Handwritten signature

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

30.05.2022) and UP Bridge Corporation Azamgarh (letter dated 30.05.2022)& Gorakhpur (letter dated 28.05.2022).

5. The technical bids were again evaluated in light of the clarifications received from bidders & clients and as per provision of RFP.

The findings of the evaluation committee are as under:

(A) Representation by M/s Mittal Brothers Engineer and Contractor vide letter dated 20.05.2022 in respect of M/s Brahma Constructions:

Sl. No.	Content of Representation	Reply received from bidder /client	Finding of evaluation Committee
1	No certificate of Well foundation bridge has been attached by them. A certificate that has been submitted is self-made and attested by CA. The experience Certificate of the client is not attached.	Bidder confirmed that they have executed well foundation work in their project (a) and attached copy of GAD and final bill. BRO in reply dated 30.05.2022, confirmed the value of work as Rs.10.89Cr which includes well foundation work.	Work of well foundation bridge has been executed by M/s Brahma Constructions with span length of 37m as mentioned in GAD. Reply is found to be in order.
2	For Project Code (a), no experience certificate has been attached with the document even though specifically required. Only the 'Taking Over Certificate' is attached which does not state what the actual date of completion was nor does it state the particulars of the project (i.e. whether well foundation or any other were used, length of span, no. of span etc.) nor does it mention the final cost of completion of the project.	BRO in reply dated 30.05.2022, confirmed the value of work as Rs.10.89Cr which includes well foundation work.	--do--
3	For Project code (a), only the CA certificate provided by them states that the mentioned project was done on well foundation. However, no document from the client be it taking over certificate or the initial work order (the only documents that have been submitted) states the project was done on well foundation. Hence keeping this in mind, it is requested that a copy of the final bill may	BRO in reply dated 30.05.2022, confirmed the value of work as Rs.10.89Cr which includes well foundation work.	--do--

ABM:

26/5/22

W

Q

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

	kindly be asked from them such that the final payment and the various components in their tender may be verified.		
4	For Project code (a), the address of the client has not been provided due to which no information can be verified on your end.	Address and details of client provided by the bidder.	Clarification on experience certificate obtained from BRO vide letter dated 30.05.2022.
5	UDIN numbers for all the CA Certificates have not been provided which is a must requirement.	Revised CA certificates with UDIN no. submitted by the bidder.	CA certificate of Net worth and Turn over submitted with bid document were having UDIN no. Other CA certificates with UDIN no. submitted by the bidder alongwith reply dated 30.05.2022.
6	According to the different balance sheets, in FY 2018-19, FY 2019-20, FY 2020-21, at first glance the signature of CA appears to be the same having the same imprint and same strokes in the signature, on multiple dates such as 26-12-2021 (For Balance Sheet of Year 2020-21), 15-01-2021 (For Balance Sheet of Year 2019-20) etc.	CA certification on his letter head certifying that, the subject documents had been issued by his signatures attached in reply.	CA has certified that the subject documents had been issued by his signature to M/s Brahma Construction.
7	Also, the required CA certificates submitted made on different dates also seem have to the same signature as in financial statements, which infers that these certificates have been fabricated by the contractor and have not been issued by the chartered accountant. This is a violation of the rules of the tender and is not according to the practices of the tender documents and hence the tender should not be considered.	CA on his letter head certified that, the subject documents had been issued by his signatures.	CA has certified that the subject documents had been issued by his signature to M/s Brahma Construction.
8.	Also, on comparison between the	Bidder has submitted	The details

AKL

21/05/22

u

g

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

previous tender documents uploaded in Nov'21 and the tender documents uploaded for this tender, it has been found that there are some discrepancies found in their tenders w.r.t. the amount received for the

Project Code (b)		
Financial Year	Previous Year (Cr.)	Present Year (Cr.)
2019-2020	1.798 Cr.	1.382 Cr.
2020-2021	0.896 Cr.	0.71 Cr.
Total	0.694 Cr.	2.092 Cr.
Difference	0.602 Cr.	

Project Code (c)		
Financial Year	Previous Year (Cr.)	Present Year (Cr.)
2018-2019	1.205 Cr.	1.206 Cr.
2019-2020	0.388 Cr.	0.419 Cr.
2020-2021	0.292 Cr.	0
Total	1.885 Cr.	1.625 Cr.
Difference	0.26 Cr.	

Project Code (d)		
Financial Year	Previous Year (Cr.)	Present Year (Cr.)
2019-2020	0.707 Cr.	0.59 Cr.
2020-2021	1.09 Cr.	0.995 Cr.
Total	1.797 Cr.	1.585 Cr.
Difference	0.212 Cr.	

different projects in various years:

that, all the works done are located at very high altitude where working season time is very limited including very heavy rain, landslides/avalanches. Due to partial communication, the intermediate bill information remains approximate. After road opening and cleaning snow figures of payment received got corrected against work completed and the same is incorporated in the tender submission April 2022.

(payment received) submitted with instant tender document are found to be lower than the previous data. As the bidder has submitted that, the data has been corrected and is on lower side wrt data submitted in 1st call, the same may be considered.

(B) Representation by M/s Royal Infraconstru Ltd. vide letter dated 23.05.2022 in respect of M/s Brahma Constructions

Sl. No.	Content of Representation	Reply received from bidder /client	Finding of evaluation Committee
1	No experience certificate from client has been attached by them about the Well foundation.	Bidder confirmed that they have executed well foundation work in their project (a) and attached copy of GAD	Work of well foundation bridge has been executed by M/s Brahma Constructions with span length of

Abhi

21/05/22

ce

8

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

		and final bill. BRO in reply dated 30.05.2022, confirmed the value of work as Rs.10.89Cr which includes well foundation work.	37m as mentioned in GAD. Reply is found to be in order.
2	'Taking Over Certificate' for Project (a), submitted by them does not mention the cost of the project neither does it mention the length of the span executed, nor the number of spans.	--do--	--do--
3	For Project (a), the work is stated as "Design and Construction of LEFTOVER WORKS.....". There is no description what these works were.	--do--	--do--
4	As No experience certificate has been attached with the document, hence neither the cost nor the specifications of the project can be verified, thus we ask that the final bill may, kindly be requested from their client, that is BRO.	--do--	--do--
5	They have not provided their client address, which does not help you in doing an independent verification of their project, nor can anyone else contact the said Client for the same.	--do--	--do--
6	They have claimed a technical capacity of 19.532 Crores, while the portal mentions it as 20.391 Crores, so there is an additional benefit given of 0.859 Crores, which is wrong and would not be in the fair spirit of the tender.	The bidder has calculated the threshold technical capacity considering up-dation factor of 1 for the FY 2020-21.	The up-dation factor of 1 should be considered for FY 2021-22. Accordingly, the details of all bidders have been verified and updated wherever required.

Attn:

31/05/22

W

8

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

7	They have given a bid capacity of Rs. 29.867 crores, while the portal mentions it as 31.362 crores, so there is an additional benefit of Rs. 1.495 crores, which is wrong and is not in the fair spirit of the tender.	The bidder has calculated the bid capacity considering up-dation factor of 1 for the FY 2020-21.	The up-dation factor of 1 should be considered for FY 2021-22. Accordingly, the details of all bidders have been verified and updated wherever required.
8	They have not provided any UDIN number for their CA certificates or Annexure-4, which is a must require document.	Revised CA certificates with UDIN no. submitted by the bidder.	CA certificate of Net worth and Turn over submitted with bid document were having UDIN no. Other CA certificates with UDIN no. submitted by the bidder alongwith reply dated 30.05.2022
9	Net Worth Certificates have been provided by them, from a different CA, than the one which has audited the financial statements. This discrepancy should also be noted.	Bidder has submitted that, CA Gurvinder Singh was their auditor for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21.	Based on the submissions in the reply of the bidder, it has been found that, CA Mritunjay Kumar was their auditor for FY 2018-19 and CA Gurvinder Singh was their auditor for FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21.
10	In all financial statements, from the year 2018 upto the year 2021, at first glance the signature of CA appears to be having the same imprint and same differences in the type of signature, on multiple dates such as 26-12-2021, 15-04-2022 etc. The CA certificates given in multiple dates also seem have to the same signature, which in a way seems that, all these certificates and	CA certification on his letter head certifying that, the subject documents had been issued by his signatures attached in reply.	CA has certified that the subject documents had been issued by his signature to M/s Brahma Construction.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

	documents, may not have been issued by the CA, but created by the contractor. This needs to be taken note of and accordingly, the said bidder, should be removed and disqualified from the tender.		
11	In Project (B), the CA certificate shows three figures of the same work, that are in the estimated cost shows - 3.669 crores, Payment received - 3.570 crores, while breakup shows 3.884 crores.	CA has submitted the revised certificate with corrected value of payment received in FY 2021-22 with UDIN no.	The Threshold capacity has been calculated without considering payment received in FY 2021-22.
12	In Project (C), the CA certificate shows three figures of the same work, that are in the estimated cost shows - 2.688 crores, Payment received - 2.575 crores, while breakup shows 2.687 crores.	CA has submitted the revised certificate with corrected value of payment received in FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-22 with UDIN no.	The Threshold capacity has been calculated without considering payment received in FY 2020-21 & FY 2021-22.
13	In Project (D), the CA certificate shows three figures of the same work, that are in the estimated cost shows - 5.8898 crores, Payment received - 2.130 crores, while breakup shows 1.926 crores.	CA has submitted the revised certificate with corrected value of payment received in FY 2021-22 with UDIN no.	The Threshold capacity has been calculated without considering payment received in FY 2021-22.
14	In their eligible project i.e., Project (a), the client's taking over certificate mentions the Date of Completion as 24.09.2017. However, the CA Certificate lists the Date of Completion as 24.09.2019.	Date of Completion is 24.09.2017.	CA Certificate mentions the Date of Completion as 24.09.2017 which has also been verified by BRO.
15	For Project (a), according to their self declaration and the CA certificate for the project, the amount of payment received by them for the year 2017-2018 is 6.930 Cr. However, according to the balance sheets and	CA has submitted that, turnover declaration is as per accounting standard-7. In AS-7 turnover not related to payment received.	CA has submitted that, turnover declaration is as per accounting standard-7. In AS-7 turnover not related to payment received.

ASW

21/05/22

W

8

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

	profit/loss statements submitted by them, the annual turnover declaration (Financial Capacity of the Bidder), the Bid Capacity information and the CA certificate for annual turnover for 5 years, the turnover for the Annual Year 2017-2018 for M/s Brahma Construction is 5.875 Cr. only. This implies that they did not receive payment worth 6.93 Cr. in 2017-2018		In 1st call of subject tender, for similar observation, opinion of independent CA Anoop K. Gujarati & Associates, Varanasi was sought and it was submitted by them that, AS-7 standard has been followed by the respondent. Secondly, turnover and the payment received is not the same and are two different part of a transaction. Further, even if the lower value of turnover as claimed in the representation is considered, the threshold technical capacity is found to be more than the required limits.
16	In the Financial Year 2017-2018, the annual turnover declared and certified by CA is 5.87 Cr. However, according to the certificates declaring work, the cumulative payment received for work done in Bhini and Thang is 7.257 Cr, which shows a difference of 1.387 Cr	--do--	--do--
17	In the Financial Year 2018-2019, the annual turnover	--do--	--do--

Asstt

31/05/22

W

[Signature]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

	declared and certified by CA is 1.66 Cr. However, according to the certificates declaring work, the cumulative payment received for work done for works Commander bridge and Thang is 1.705 Cr, which shows a difference of 0.045 Cr		
18	In the Financial Year 2019-2020, the annual turnover declared and certified by CA is 2.25 Cr. However, according to the certificates declaring work, the cumulative payment received for work done for works Commander bridge, Badamgarh, Girthi Ganga is 2.391 Cr, which shows a difference of 0.141 Cr.	--do--	--do--
19	In the Financial Year 2020-2021, the annual turnover declared and certified by CA is 3.01 Cr. However, according to the certificates declaring work, the cumulative payment received for work done for works Commander bridge, Badamgarh, Girthi Ganga, Thang is 3.031 Cr, which shows a difference of 0.021 Cr.	--do--	--do--

(C) Representation by M/s Royal Infraconstru Ltd. vide letter dated 23.05.2022 in respect of M/s R K Constructions (INDIA) Pvt. Ltd.

Sl. No.	Content of Representation	Reply received from bidder /client	Finding of evaluation Committee
1	From their submission it seems that the project submitted was not a single contract and consists of multiple contract and hence	Technical capacity has been calculated based on Experience certificate issued	As per the clarification dated 28.05.2022 received from UP Bridge corporation

Alkhur

31/05/22

W

[Signature]

**NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI**

	should to be considered separately.	by concerned department.	Gorakhpur, the project(B) was actually not a single work but 09 different projects under 9 nos of different agreements. Accordingly, consequent on the clarification received from the client, the bid submitted by M/s R K Constructions (INDIA) Pvt. Ltd. is short of required minimum Threshold technical capacity and is therefore liable to be declared as non responsive. A separate notice to the bidder for making material misrepresentation, needs to be issued as per RFP.
2	In the other project, in the CA Certificate they have clearly stated, that there were 2 separate contracts (we are also sure that they are separate) and accordingly the separate contracts makes them unable to fulfill the technical threshold capacity.	--do--	--do--

(D) Representation by M/s Royal Infraconstru Ltd. vide letter dated 23.05.2022 in respect of M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers and Contractors

Sl. No.	Content of Representation	Reply received from bidder /client	Finding of evaluation Committee
1	M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers &	Most of the CA	Reply is in order.

Abhi

31/05/22

W

[Signature]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

	Contractors have not provided any UDIN no. for CA certificate or Annexure-IV, which is mustrequired document.	certificates and annex have UDIN no. However, CA certificates with UDIN no. submitted again. CA certificate submitted have all information required for annex-IV. By mistake it has not be labelled as Annex-IV. Revised certificate with Annex-IV submitted.	
--	---	---	--

It is submitted that the evaluation has been carried out by the Evaluation Committee based on the bid documents received and subsequent clarifications received from the bidders & clients. The veracity and correctness of the documents uploaded/ submitted by the bidders lies with them only. Notwithstanding above, the clause 2.6 of section-2 of RFP governs the overall evaluation.

Clause 2.6.3 of section-2 of the RFP is reproduced as under:

"In case it is found during the evaluation or at any time before signing of the agreement or after its execution and during the period of defect liability subsistence thereof, that one or more of the eligibility and /or qualification requirements have not been met by the bidder, or the bidder has made material misrepresentation or has given any materially incorrect or false information, the bidder shall be disqualified forthwith if not yet appointed as the contractor either by issue of LOA or entering into of the agreement, and if selected bidder has already been issued the LOA or has entered into the agreement, as the case may be, the same shall, notwithstanding anything to contrary contained therein or in this RFP, be liable to be terminated, by a communication in writing by the Authority to the selected bidder or the contractor, as the case may be, without the Authority being liable in any manner whatsoever to the selected bidder or the contractor. In such an event, the Authority shall be entitled to suspend the bidder for participation in the tendering process for the works of MoRTH/NHAI/NHIDCL and works under other Centrally Sponsored Schemes, for a period of one year from the bid due date of this work or forfeit and appropriate the performance security, as the case may, as Damages, without prejudice to any other right or remedy that may be available to the Authority under the Bidding Documents and / or the Agreement, or otherwise."

Adm

31/05/22

W

[Signature]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
REGIONAL OFFICE, UP-EAST, VARANASI

6. Based upon the aforesaid findings, the Evaluation Committee recommends the following result of technical evaluation:

Sr. No.	Name of the Firms/Bidders	Status
01.	M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers & Contractors	Technically Qualified
02.	M/s Brahma Construction	Technically Qualified
03.	M/s Royal Infra Construction Limited	Technically Qualified
04.	M/s RAC Developers Pvt. Ltd.	Technically not Qualified
* 05.	M/s RK Constructions India Private Limited	Technically not Qualified

The revised detailed evaluation sheet is enclosed.


In view of the above, Evaluation Committee recommends for the approval of the revised Technical Evaluation done by the Committee for uploading the same on the E-tender Portal as per the E-tendering guidelines for information of all. The date of opening of Financial Bids may be fixed on 02.06.2022.

Submitted for perusal and approval, please.


(SP Pathak)
GM(Tech.)/PD
PIU-Azamgarh


(C.M. Dwivedi)
GM(Tech.)/PD
PIU-Gorakhpur



(Abhishek)
Manager (Tech.)
RO-UP (East)


(R.K. Paswan)
JAO/F&A Unit
RO-UP (East)

Regional Officer

Approved. However, issue notice
as per RFP to bidder (X) for making
material misrepresentation.

P.D. Azamgarh


31/5/22

Name of Work: Tender for "Construction of 2.11.880 m. Major Bridge on well foundation over River Gomti on NH-128A (Parallel to Shastri Bridge) in Jaunpur city in the State of Uttar Pradesh on Engineering, Procurement & Construction (EPC) Mode in the State of Uttar Pradesh" (2nd Call).

Re-Evaluation of Technical Bid based on representations & replies received from bidders and clients

Estimated Cost: 22.56 Cr.

S. No.	Item Description	Ref. Cl.	M/s Mittal Brothers Engineers And Contractors	M/s Brahma Construction	M/s Royal Infra Construction Limited	M/s RAC Developers Private Limited	M/s R K Constructions India Private Limited
1	Online bid submission alongwith Scanned copy of documents defining constitution, legal status, place of registration and principal place of business.	ITB	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted	Technical Evaluation not carried out as BID not submitted on BIMS Portal.	Submitted
2	Appendix-I/A, (letter comprising the Technical Bid) including Annexure I to VI and supporting certificates/ documents.	2.11.1 (a)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
3	Power of Attorney for signing the BID as per the format at Appendix-III.	2.11.1 (b) Appendix III	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
4	BID Security amounting to Rs. 34,00,000 in the Form of Bank Guarantee.	2.20	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
5	Copy of Online receipt towards payment of cost of BID document of Rs. 10,000/- in Authority's designated Bank Account.	NIT & 2.11.1 (e)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
6	Integrity Pact (IP) duly signed by Authorized Signatory.	2.11.1(i)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
7	An Undertaking from the person having POA referred to in Sub. Clause-(b) above that they agree and abide by the Bid Documents uploaded by NHAI amendments uploaded, if any.	2.11.1(j)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
8	Annexure-VII of Appendix-I/A showing details of all project works (Ref. Clause 10.3 (iv) of Document for EPC Agreement).	2.11.1(k)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
9	Copies of duly audited complete annual accounts of the bidder or of each member (in case of joint venture) for preceding 5 years.	2.11.1(m)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
10	Certificate regarding compliance with restrictions under Rule 144 (xi) of the General Finance Rules as per format given in Appendix-IX.	2.11.1(n)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
11	Technical Bid uploaded on BIMS Portal and uploaded the receipt on e-tender portal.	2.11.1(p)	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
12	Bid Capacity: Qualifying amount 22.56 Cr.	2.2.2.1	301.15 Cr	31.362 Cr	880.54 Cr		39.14 Cr
13	Threshold Technical Capacity: Qualifying amount = 16.92 Cr.	2.2.2.2 (i) of RFP	253.83 Cr	20.391 Cr	846.00 Cr		11.075 Cr (Not Qualified)
14	Technical Capacity as per clause 2.2.2.2(iii) of RFP in case of standalone bridge cost less than 1000 Cr	2.2.2.2 (iii) of RFP	Qualified	Qualified	Qualified		Qualified
15	Net Worth: Qualifying Amount= 1.13 Cr	2.2.2.3 (i) of RFP	12.19 Cr	2.45 Cr	229.34 Cr		3.00 Cr
16	Min. Average Annual Turnover Qualifying Amount= 3.38 Cr	2.2.2.3 (ii) of RFP	66.91 Cr	4.41 Cr	468.18 Cr		3.76 Cr
17	Undertaking that the bid shall remain valid for the period of 120 days after deadline date for bid submission the firm has not abandoned/been restricted	1.2.2	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted		Submitted
18	Weather bidder is technically qualified (Y/N)		YES	YES	YES		NO

(SP Pathak)
21/05/22

GM/Project Director
PIU-Azamgarh

(CM Dwivedi)
21/05/22

GM/Project Director
PIU-Gorakhpur

(Abhishek)
21/05/22

Manager (Tech)
RO-UP(East), Varanasi

(Rajesh Kumar Paswan)
21/05/22

JAO, F&A Unit
RO-UP(East), Varanasi