

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

PIU - REWARI

Sub: E-tendering for Construction of 9 No. Foot Over Bridges (FOBs) in Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur section of NH-48 from Km.42.700 to Km.107.100 in the State of Haryana on EPC Mode - **Reg. Finalization of Technical Evaluation (After consideration of Representation submitted by bidders.**

E-tender for construction of 9 No. FOBs on Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur section of NH-48 from Km.42.700 to Km.107.100 was invited from PIU-Rewari from 07.06.2024 with last submission date 04.07.2024 at 11.00 hrs after approval of the estimate amounting to Rs. 16.52 crore (Excluding GST) from Competent Authority, NHAI vide e-office computer no. 237751.

2. This office vide O/o No. 749 dt. 03.07.2024 constituted Committee for opening and evaluation of Technical & Financial bids for the subject work comprising of following members: -

(A) Members of Bid Evaluation Committee

- | | | |
|--|---|----------|
| 1. Sh. Yogesh Tilak, Project Director, PIU-Rewari | : | Convenor |
| 2. Sh. Akash Padhi, Project Director, PIU-Dwarka | : | Member |
| 3. Sh. Yogesh Kumar Pathak, Manager (T), PIU-Rewari | : | Member |
| 4. Sh. Anshul Vats, Dy. Manager (T), RO-Delhi | : | Member |
| 5. Sh. Arun Kumar Verma, Asst. Manager (F&A), PIU-Rewari | : | Member |

(B) Vide e-office computer no. 240202, request was made for appointment of a Financial Consultant for evaluation of technical bids and other services. The same was approved by Competent Authority- Financial Consultants (M/s Shinde Chavan Gandhi & Company)

3. In its earlier meeting held on 30.07.2024 (MoM attached F/A), Evaluation Committee recommended 05 no. of bidders as technically qualified out of total 09 no. of bids and to display the result of technical evaluation on the web portal for 7 days to give opportunity to bidders to respond including reasons for disqualification, if any. The Technical Evaluation Result was declared vide letter no. 1121 dated 22.08.2024.

4. Further, Total 3 nos of bidders have been submitted the reply of clarification through e-mail of the technically non-responsive as per the RFP and the same has examined by Financial Consultant. Financial Consultant has submitted the report vide letter dated 30.08.2024 copy attached and apprised the Committee that

"In the representation submitted by all the 03 bidders and there is no change in results recommended vide our report dated 30.07.2024. Our comments to the representation made by the bidders."

5. The above report of Financial Consultant was deliberated the Evaluation Committee recommends to open the Financial Bid of the following technically responsive bidders:

S.no	Name of the qualifying bidder	Technical Result
01	Airef Engineers (P) Ltd	Qualified
02	ASAP Prefab (P) Ltd	Qualified
03	Chaudhary Construction Company (P) Ltd	Qualified
04	Garg Builders	Qualified
05	Sudharma Infratech (P) Ltd	Qualified

6. Accordingly, committee agreed for evaluation of technical bids and opening financial bid as per the Clause no.3.2 of RFP for qualified bidders.

In view of the above, approval of the Competent Authority is solicited for opening the financial bids as per the Clause no.3.2 of RFP.

Submitted please.

[Final MOM of Technical.pdf](#)

30/09/2024 06:05 PM

प्रकाश कुमार तिवारी|PRAKASH TIWARI
उप -प्रबंधक (तकनीकी)|DEPUTY MANAGER(T)

Note # 44

30/09/2024 06:58 PM

योगेश तिलक|YOGESH TILAK
पीडी पीआईयू- रेवारी|PD PIU- REWARI

Note # 45

Please put up.

01/10/2024 02:35 PM

मोहम्मद सफ़ी|MOHAMMAD SAFI
क्षेत्रीय अधिकारी (दिल्ली)|RO-DELHI

Note # 46

Please see.

01/10/2024 03:37 PM

अनिल कुमार|ANIL KUMAR
प्रमुख (एफ एंड ए) इकाई|HEAD (F & A) UNIT

Note # 47

Ref note # 43 ,As Per recommendation of report of Financial Consultant was deliberated the Evaluation Committee Approval may be accorded for opening financial bid as per the Clause no.3.2 of RFP for qualified bidders. for construction of 9 No. FOBs on Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur section of NH-48 from Km.42.700 to Km.107.100 at PIU-Rewari.

Submitted Please

03/10/2024 11:31 AM

अरुण कुमार वर्मा|ARUN KUMAR VERMA
डीडीओ (एफ एंड ए) इकाई|DDO (F & A) UNIT

Note # 48

As requested by PIU-Rewari, approval may be accorded for opening of Financial Bid in light of recommendation of Evaluation Committee MoM please.

03/10/2024 02:57 PM

अनिल कुमार|ANIL KUMAR
प्रमुख (एफ एंड ए) इकाई|HEAD (F & A) UNIT

Note # 49

04/10/2024 10:00 AM

मोहम्मद सफ़ी|MOHAMMAD SAFI
क्षेत्रीय अधिकारी (दिल्ली)|RO-DELHI

Note # 50

04/10/2024 10:11 AM

अनिल कुमार|ANIL KUMAR
प्रमुख (एफ एंड ए) इकाई|HEAD (F & A) UNIT

Note # 51

08/10/2024 03:22 PM

योगेश तिलक|YOGESH TILAK
पीडी पीआईयू- रेवाड़ी|PD PIU- REWARI

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA
PIU - REWARI

Sub: E-tendering for Construction of 9 No. Foot Over Bridges (FOBs) in Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur section of NH-48 from Km.42.700 to Km.107.100 In the State of Haryana on EPC Mode - Reg. Finalization of Technical Evaluation (After consideration of Representation submitted by bidders.

E-tender for construction of 9 No. FOBs on Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur section of NH-48 from Km.42.700 to Km.107.100 was invited from PIU-Rewari from 07.06.2024 with last submission date 04.07.2024 at 11.00 hrs after approval of the estimate amounting to Rs. 16.52 crore (Excluding GST) from Competent Authority, NHAI vide e-office computer no. 237751.

2. This office vide O/o No. 749 dt. 03.07.2024 constituted Committee for opening and evaluation of Technical & Financial bids for the subject work comprising of following members: -

(A) Members of Bid Evaluation Committee

- | | | |
|--|---|----------|
| 1. Sh. Yogesh Tilak, Project Director, PIU-Rewari | : | Convenor |
| 2. Sh. Akash Padhi, Project Director, PIU-Dwarka | : | Member |
| 3. Sh. Yogesh Kumar Pathak, Manager (T), PIU-Rewari | : | Member |
| 4. Sh. Anshul Vats, Dy. Manager (T), RO-Delhi | : | Member |
| 5. Sh. Arun Kumar Verma, Asst. Manager (F&A), PIU-Rewari | : | Member |

(B) Vide e-office computer no. 240202, request was made for appointment of a Financial Consultant for evaluation of technical bids and other services. The same was approved by Competent Authority-Financial Consultants (M/s Shinde Chavan Gandhi & Company)

3. In its earlier meeting held on 30.07.2024 (MoM attached F/A), Evaluation Committee recommended 05 no. of bidders as technically qualified out of total 09 no. of bids and to display the result of technical evaluation on the web portal for 7 days to give opportunity to bidders to respond including reasons for disqualification, if any. The Technical Evaluation Result was declared vide letter no. 1121 dated 22.08.2024.

4. Further, Total 3 nos of bidders have been submitted the reply of clarification through e-mail of the technically non-responsive as per the RFP and the same has examined by Financial Consultant. Financial Consultant has submitted the report vide letter dated 30.08.2024 copy attached and apprised the Committee that

"In the representation submitted by all the 03 bidders and there is no change in results recommended vide our report dated 30.07.2024. Our comments to the representation made by the bidders."


5. The above report of Financial Consultant was deliberated the Evaluation Committee recommends to open the Financial Bid of the following technically responsive bidders:


S.no	Name of the qualifying bidder
01	Airef Engineers (P) Ltd
02	ASAP Prefab (P) Ltd
03	Chaudhary Construction Company (P) Ltd
04	Garg Builders
05	Sudharma Infratech (P) Ltd


In view of the above, Committee recommended for approval of above qualifying bidders for opening financial bid as per the Clause no.3.2 of RFP.


Meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.


(Arun Kumar Verma)
Asst. Manager (F&A)
PIU-Rewari


(Anshul Vats)
Dy. Manager (T)
RO-Delhi


(Yogesh Kumar Pathak)
Manager (Tech)
PIU - Rewari


(Akash Padhi)
Project Director
PIU-Dwarka


(Yogesh Tilak) 04/09/24
DGM(T)/Project Director
PIU-Rewari



Ref.: SCGC/NHAI/2024-25/51

Date: 30th August 2024

To
DGM (T)/ Project Director
Project Implementation Unit-Rewari
National Highways Authority of India
Plot No-10, Sector-32, Institutional Area,
Gurgaon-122003, Haryana

Sub: Technical Evaluation Report on the Bids received for "Construction of Foot over Bridges (FOB's) at 9 locations on Gurgaon - Kotputli - Jaipur Section of NH-48 from Km. 42.700 to Km.107.100 in the State of Haryana on EPC mode."

Ref:

1. Our Technical Evaluation report dated 30.07.2024
2. Our interim evaluation report dated 21.07.2024

Sir,

This has reference to our technical evaluation report dated 30.07.2024 whereby we recommended following 05 bidders out of total 09 bidders as technically qualified.

Sr. No	Name of the Applicant
1.	Airef Engineers (P) Ltd.
2.	ASAP Prefab (P) Ltd.
3.	Chaudhary Construction Company (P) Ltd.
4.	Garg Builders
5.	Sudharma Infratech (P) Ltd.

NHAI vide its letter dated 22.08.2024 gave opportunity to the non-responsive bidders to submit representation, if any. Accordingly following 03 bidders have submitted their representation to the Authority.

Sr. No	Name of the Applicant
1.	Dhingra Brothers (India)
2.	Kamal Builders
3.	Satish Aggarwal & Company

We have evaluated the representation submitted by all the 03 bidders and there is no change in results recommended vide our report dated 30.07.2024. Our comments to the representation made by the bidders are enclosed as Annexure-1.

In view of the above, the Authority may seek updated bid capacity from the following technically qualified bidders as on day before opening of financial bid:

Sr. No	Name of the Applicant
1.	Airef Engineers (P) Ltd.
2.	ASAP Prefab (P) Ltd.
3.	Chaudhary Construction Company (P) Ltd.
4.	Garg Builders
5.	Sudharma Infratech (P) Ltd.

This is for your reference, record and further necessary action.

Shinde Chavan Gandhi & Company

Swapnil Gandhi
Authorised Signatory



Annexure-1- Evaluation of representation submitted by the bidders

Dhingra Brothers (India)

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
1.	The bidder was asked to clarify as to why the claimed Project code A pertaining to fixing of sign Boards and the claimed Project code C, D & E pertaining to providing of crash barriers be considered as eligible projects for the purpose of evaluation The bidder in its response submitted that the claimed Project Code B, with a value of Rs. 6.25 crores, fulfills the eligibility criteria as per Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) Technical Capacity of the RFP, which states that one similar work of 20% of the estimated cost of Rs. 3.30 crores is required. The explanation given by the bidder has been considered acceptable since the project code B qualifies as an eligible project. However, the claimed projects A, C, D & E has been assessed as ineligible projects as per the clause 2.2.2.5 (iii). Further, as per clause 2.2.2.6 (ii) of RFP, supply of goods or equipment is not considered as construction work for a project to qualify as an Eligible Project under Categories 3 and 4. Accordingly, the threshold technical capacity of the bidder, based on the only remaining project code B, is assessed at Rs. 6.25 crores as against the minimum requirement of Rs. 12.39 crore thereby rendering the bidder disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement under clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of the RFP.	The Project Code A: Fixing of signboards, which is considered part of the construction work scope. Project Codes C, D, and E: Provision of crash barriers, which also falls under construction activities. Additionally, we are providing details of another project that fulfills the requirements under clause 2.2.2.2 (i), ensuring that our total Technical Capacity exceeds the Threshold Technical Capacity of Rs 12.39 crore. The claimed Project Code B, with a value of Rs. 6.25 crores, fulfills the eligibility criteria as per Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) Technical Capacity of the RFP, which states that one similar work of 20% of the estimated cost of Rs. 3.30 crores is required.	The explanation given by the bidder is not considered acceptable. Projects A, C, D & E have been assessed as ineligible projects as per the clause 2.2.2.5 (iii). Further, as per clause 2.2.2.6 (ii) of RFP, supply of goods or equipment is not considered as construction work for a project to qualify as an Eligible Project under Categories 3 and 4. The additional project claimed by the bidder in its representation cannot be considered acceptable for evaluation as the same was not claimed in the original submitted bid. Therefore, the bidder remains Non-responsive for not meeting the minimum requirement under clause 2.2.2.2 (i) of the RFP.
2.	The bidder was also asked to clarify on the submitted statement of existing	We originally claimed 10 projects as existing commitments for the	The claim of the bidder that the Bid Capacity submitted at the time

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
	commitments since the same was not as per the format provided in the RFP. The bidder in its response acknowledges the format discrepancy in the para below the table containing the value of B and submitted the revised statement of existing commitments. The explanation and the document submitted by the bidder has been considered unacceptable. The bidder in its original bid claimed 10 projects as existing commitments for purpose of assessment of Value of B. However, in response to the clarification sought, the statement of existing commitments submitted by bidder does not include 2 projects claimed in the original bid but include 3 new projects which were not claimed in the original submitted bid. Further, the submitted revised statement is not certified by the Statutory Auditor and is not as per the format of RFP. Therefore, in absence of sufficient information, the bid capacity of the bidder has been assessed as Nil thereby rendering the bidder disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement under clause 2.2.2.1 of the RFP.	assessment of Value of B. Since the submission of our bid, 2 of these projects have been completed and we have taken on 3 new projects. due to this, we updated our statement of existing commitments to reflect the current status. We confirm that the Bid Capacity submitted at the time of the bid submission is accurate and should be considered as the valid figure. The information provided on 25.07.2024 was mistakenly sent and does not reflect our actual Bid Capacity. We will promptly provide the corrected documentation, which will be certified by the Statutory Auditor, as per the required format.	of the bid submission is accurate and should be considered as the valid figure is not considered acceptable since the submitted statement of existing commitments is not as per the format provided in the RFP. Therefore, in absence of sufficient information, the bid capacity of the bidder has been assessed as Nil thereby rendering the bidder disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement under clause 2.2.2.1 of the RFP.

Kamal Builders

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
1.	The bidder has claimed only 01 (one) project for assessment of its technical capacity under clause 2.2.2.2 (i) and 2.2.2.2 (ii). The Bidder was asked to clarify as to why the claimed Project pertaining to construction of Platform, Duty Huts and OH water Tank be considered as an eligible project for the purpose of evaluation. The bidder, in its response highlighted the point 12 (scope of work) which states of execution of FOB work in said project. The explanation given by the bidder has been considered unacceptable. As per the submitted experience certificate, FOB is the part of scope of work and therefore may be considered as an eligible project under category-4 since the project for which RFP is invited also pertains to construction of FOBs. However, the claimed project has been awarded to JV (SPG-Kamal JV) with Kamal builders having share of 49%. From the submitted certificate and the JV agreement between parties, it is not ascertainable whether the FOB has been constructed by the bidder or the other JV member. In absence of the sufficient documentary information, the project has been considered as ineligible for purpose of assessment of technical capacity. Therefore, the technical capacity of bidder has been assessed as Nil thereby rendering the bidder disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i). The Bidder was also asked to identify the page number from the submitted documents demonstrating the experience of having completed at least one similar work of 20% of Estimated Project Cost from the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 specified in Clause 2.2.2.5. The bidder did not specifically respond to the query. Since only one project has been claimed by the bidder and the same has been assessed as ineligible as	We have executed the work namely "Akbarpur-Sohawal Section (Zone-I) Miscellaneous work such as construction of Platform duty hut at level crossing, OH Water Tank mother allied works between Akbarpur (including) and Sohawal (excluding) in connection with 'Proposed Doubling of Barabanki - Akbarpur (161 KM) of Lucknow Division Agreement No. 74-W/3/2/391-A/WA/LKO Dt 21.10.2019 in the name of SPGIPL KB INC JV and the share of Kamal Builders is 49 %. We have executed the work in Joint Venture proportion of 49% Further, this can be verified from Northern Railway (Contact Person:	The explanation given by the bidder has been reviewed. In absence of any documentary support, it is not ascertainable which of the JV member has actually constructed the FOB. Therefore, the technical capacity of bidder has been assessed as Nil thereby rendering the bidder disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i). Since only one project has been claimed by the bidder and the same has been assessed as ineligible as explained above, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii).

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
	explained above, the bidder stands disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.2 (ii).	Mr. Anil Aneja, Mobile No. 9818569465).	

Satish Aggarwal & Company

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
1.	The bidder was asked to clarify as to why the values of civil engineering work against each Financial Year (in table to calculate Value of A) does not match with the Contract Receipts as appearing in its audited annual accounts. The bidder in its response re-submitted its annual accounts along with the annual accounts of another Joint Venture with 40% share of the bidder in such Joint Venture. The explanation and documents furnished by the bidder has been considered unacceptable. The bidder (Satish Aggarwal and Co, Amritsar), in addition to its own turnover, has additionally claimed Turnover a JV (Satish Aggarwal and Co, JV) for the purpose of assessment of Financial Capacity and Value of A (Bid Capacity). Upon review of the annual accounts of the bidder and such JV, it is evident that the bidder's share of profit in the JV has been duly accounted for in the annual accounts of the Bidder. Therefore, claiming the bidder's share in JV's turnover as additional turnover for the purpose of assessment of Financial Capacity and Value of A (Bid Capacity) is principally incorrect and not justified. Therefore, the "contracts receipts" as appearing in the annual accounts of the bidder has been considered for the purpose of assessment of Financial Capacity and Bid Capacity. Contract Receipts of Rs. 16.20 cr. in F.Y. 2018-19 with multiplication factor of 1.25 has been considered as Value of A.	Certificate Value A and B of Statutory Auditor Certify with UDIN All balance sheets are attached of M/s Satish Aggarwal and Co. Amritsar and Satish Aggarwal and Co. Joint Venture are attached 40% Share of m/ s Satish Aggarwal and Co. Joint Venture and Turn over certificate of Two Firms and each share are mentioned of Turn over Certificate Signed By M/s Shiv K. gupta and Co. Statutory Auditor with UDIN attached and also attached the time of Bidding tender with MOU attached. The table containing the value of all existing commitments are attached. We are attached financial capacity with UDIN. Total Value of Engineering works with Turnover certificate attached.	Bidder has submitted the same documents as submitted earlier in its bid and in response to clarification sought. Therefore, the assessment of the bidder with respect to its bid capacity remains unchanged and the bidder remains non-responsive for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.1 of the RFP.
2.	The bidder was also asked to clarify as to why the documentary evidence countersigned by the Client or its Engineer-in-charge for all the existing commitments and on-going works were not	We are already attached all client certificate signed by Executive Engineer.	Bidder has submitted the same documents as submitted earlier in its bid and in

S. No.	Reason for Non-Responsive	Representation by the Bidder	Our Comments
	submitted for the purpose of assessment of Value of B. The bidder in its response clarified that it has already attached all client certificate signed by Executive Engineer. The explanation and documents furnished by the bidder has been considered unacceptable. The project name, the project cost and the work completed as specified in the table of existing commitment (Value of B) does not match with any of certificates submitted by the bidder (except for one project). Further, the bidder has submitted statutory auditor's certificates for most of the projects instead of client certificates. In absence of sufficient documentary support, full value of contract has been considered for the purpose of assessment of value of B except for one project. Accordingly, the Bid Capacity of the bidder has been assessed as Rs. 3.37 Cr as against the minimum requirement of Rs. 16.52 crore. Furthermore, the bidder was also asked to clarify on the submitted statement of existing commitments since the same was not as per the format provided in the RFP. The bidder in its response resubmitted the table containing the value of all existing commitments. The document furnished by the bidder has been considered unacceptable since the certification of statutory auditor required for the table containing the existing commitments (i.e. Value of B) has, instead been given for Value of A which is not in line with requirements of RFP. In view of above, the bidder has been assessed as disqualified for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.1 of the RFP.		response to clarification sought. Therefore, the assessment of the bidder with respect to its bid capacity remains unchanged and the bidder remains non-responsive for not meeting the minimum requirement as per clause 2.2.2.1 of the RFP.