## EVALUATION REPORT (As Per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)

National Transmission and Despatch Co. Ltd (NTDCL) 1. Name of Procuring Agency National Competitive Bidding (NCB) Method of Procurement 2. Subsoil Investigation of 220kV D/C Twin Bundled Title of Procurement Transmission Line from 500/220kV Faisalabad Grid Station to 220kV Lalian Grid Station (Approx. 56km). TLS-07-2021 4. Tender Inquiry No. TS445711E PPRA Ref No. 5. 01/04/2021 at 11:00 A.M. Date & Time of Bid Closing 6. Date & Time of Bid Opening Technical: 01/04/2021 at 11:30 A.M. 7. Financial: 21/05/2021 at 03:30 P.M. No of Bids Received 8. 05 Evaluation and Comparison of Bid as per Section-I Criteria for Bid Evaluation 9. "Instructions to Bidders" of Bidding Documents 10. Details of Bid(s) Evaluation

Name of the Bidders	Technical (If	Financial (If Applicable)	Quoted Bid Price inclusive of PST (PKR)	Corrected/ Evaluated/Dis counted Bid Price inclusive of PST (PKR)	Award Price inclusive of PST (PKR)	Remarks		
M/s. Firm DECON Int'l Pvt. Ltd. Lahore	NIL	NIL	12,250,000	9,800,000	9,800,000	Responsive		
M/s. The DRILLER Pakistan, Lahore	NIL	NIL	Non-Responsive  The firm is considered non-responsive on account of following grounds:  • The bidder submitted Form of Price Bid in the technical beand disclosed bid price and hence the entire bid is rejected as per Clause IB 23.2 of Bid Data Sheet of bidding documents.  • The bidder did not submit undertaking of Bid Security per requirements of Clause IB 11.1 of Bid Data Sheet					

1 Adc 236 21. Poch a 34907 Page 1 of 4

	<del>,</del>
	Non-Responsive
	The firm is considered non-responsive on account of following grounds:
	<ul> <li>Audited financial reports of year 2019-2020 and 2017-2018 were without signature and stamp of auditor.</li> <li>Abstract of eligible assignments of key personnel i.e. Form QF-7C was not provided. Moreover, the proposed personnel are neither on the payroll of M/s. RTCC nor their consent to work on this project was provided.</li> <li>The proposed geologist did not meet the criteria defined in Form QF-7 (a).</li> <li>In the list for ownership of tools and plants submitted for subsciling sections QF-page of items were missing from the</li> </ul>
M/s. RTCC Pvt. Ltd., Lahore	subsoil investigation, 05 no. of items were missing from the list of equipment given in Form QF-8(b).  • Affidavit for ownership of all the mentioned tools and plants for subsoil investigation work required by Appendix-E to bid (sheet 3) was not provided.  • Provincial Revenue Authority registration for Punjab province as per requirement of clause IB 3.1 (a) (ii) was not provided.  • An affidavit that the Bidder has not been blacklisted pursuant to Clause IB 3.1(a) (ii) was not provided.  • An Affidavit that the Bidder has read and accepted NTDC's SOP for blacklisting of Contractors pursuant to Clause IB 3.1(a)(ii) was not provided  • Proof of purchase of Bidding Documents from the Employer was not provided.  • Proposed program for subsoil investigation work (Appendix - D) was not filled properly.
	In light of above, the bid is incomplete and found to be substantially non-responsive as per clause 26.4 of BDS and hence was not considered for detailed Evaluation.
	Non-Responsive
M/S. BIRUDO	The firm is considered non-responsive on account of following grounds:
Engineers Lahore	<ul> <li>The bidder did not submitted Audited Financial Statements for last three years as per requirements of Clause IB 3.1(b) (Information to be submitted in prescribed Form QF-5 of Appendix-G to Bid given in the Bidding Documents). The bidder was asked vide post bid clarification to submit the</li> </ul>

<u> </u>	
-	same. In response, the bidder has again not provided the same.
	In view of the above, the bidder does not meet the Qualification requirements for sub-soil work as stipulated in Clause IB 3.1 (b) of Bidding Data Sheet of bidding documents and hence was not Evaluated further.
	Non-Responsive
	The bid is considered non-responsive on account of following grounds:
	<ul> <li>Key personnel i.e. Structural Engineer and Site Supervisor was not proposed by the bidder as required vide Form QF- 7 (a). Moreover, the proposed geologist did not meet the</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>criteria defined in Form QF-7 (a).</li> <li>In the affidavit for ownership of tools and plants submitted for subsoil investigation, 05 no. of items were missing from the list of equipment given in Form QF-8(b).</li> <li>In Appendix-C, M/s. Geo Pak has been proposed for sub soil investigation by the bidder and it is stated that the subcontractor will be utilized where needed with the approval of Employer.</li> </ul>
M/s. MECONS (Pvt.) Ltd.	However, in the experience documents submitted for the proposed sub-contractor, it has been observed that a number of projects claimed by the bidder in lieu of contractual experience requirements of Clause IB 3.1 (b) (1) of BDS have been performed by the proposed sub-contractor. The qualification criteria defined in IB 3.1 (b) (1) of BDS is reproduced below:
	"The bidder should have experience in execution of at least three (03) project of similar complexity in subsoil investigation using modern techniques, tools and plants for taking soil samples, transportation and testing in the laboratory within the last ten (10) years."
	From the above, it is clear that <u>qualification documents of sub-contractor do not count towards the qualification of the bidder and a number of projects claimed by the bidder in Form QF-2 do not contribute towards contractual experience requirements of the bidder.</u>

In	light	of	above,	the	bidder	did	not	meet	qualification
requirements and is found to be substantially non-responsive a						responsive as			
per Clause 26.2 of BDS and hence was not considered for detailed									
eva	luatio	n.							

11. Lowest Evaluated Responsive Bidder

M/s. Firm DECON Int'l Pvt. Ltd. Lahore

12. Any other additional/supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share

Nil

Signature			
-	7.5	 	

Official Stamp CHIEF ENGINEER (MP&M) NTDC

Note: Evaluation Results are based on detailed Bid Evaluation Report. In case of any conflict, the Contents of Bid Evaluation Report shall prevail.