## EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR THE WORK.

Remodeling and Extension of Bara River Canal System, District Khyber.

(ADP / AIP No. 2326/195197/2021-22).

Improvement of Structure, Canal Banks & Outlets (Package -VI)

Bid submission date: 07/12/2021.

- The Notice Inviting E-Bidding on Single Stage Two Envelope procedure of KPPRA Rule for the above works were called through Information Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa vide this office letter No. Irr: & HP/Khy/5472/3-T, dated 18/11/2021 for publication in the leading National Daily Newspapers. (Copy attached as <u>Annex-I</u>).
- The Notice Inviting E-Bidding was published in Daily Mashriq Newspaper, Peshawar vide INF(P) 5911/21 and also uploaded on the Irrigation Website. (Copy attached as <u>Annex-II</u>).
- Bid soliciting / bidding documents comprising of evaluation criteria for technical bids were uploaded on the Irrigation Department Website for downloading by the intending bidders.
- 4. Procuring Committee for bid opening and evaluation was constituted vide Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Hydel Power Division, District Khyber office letter No. Irr: & HP/Khy/5313/3-T, dated: 19/11/2021 (Copy attached as Annex-III)
  - 5. Sealed Technical and Financial Bids for the above works were submitted by 10 No. Bidders for the subject noted work upto 12:00 noon of 07/12/2021.
  - 6. On stipulated date and time in the office of the Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Hydel Power Division, District Khyber i.e. dated 07/12/2021 at 12:30 PM, the technical bids were opened in presence of the contractors and Procuring Committee. The name of the bidder, presence of affidavit of 2% bid security in financial envelop, non-Blacklisting and non-litigation affidavit were announced. (Copy of attendance sheet attached as Annex-IV).

jusang20 S

Page 1 of 3

Scanned with CamScanner

7. Due to non-submission of affidavit of 2% bid security in the technical bid, 06 No. technical bids were declared ineligible for further evaluation and only 04 No. bidders were considered eligible for further evaluation of the Procuring Committee in light of the technical evaluation criteria as per Bid Soliciting Documents. Detail is as under:

S.No	Name of Firm	No. of copies submitted	Sealed Financial Envelop (Yes/No)	Affidavit of 2% Bid Security. (Yes/No)	Eligible for Technical Evaluation (Yes/No)	
01	M/S M. Younas Builder	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
02	M/S New Bright Enterprises	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
03	M/S Khalil Construction	01	Yes	No	No	
05	M/S Zeeshan & Roman	01	Yes	No	No	
06	M/S Watch Construction (Only one technical proposal submitted for both works)	01	Yes	No	No	
07	M/S Pir Muhammad & Co.	02	Yes	Yes	Yes	
08	M/S Baz & Haji Construction Co.	01	Yes	No	No	
09	M/S Seena Gul Asir	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
10	M/S Maida Gul (Only one technical proposal submitted for both works)	01	Yes	No	No	

- 8. The following 04 bidders were declared eligible for further evaluation:
  - M/S Pir Muhammad & Co.
  - 2. M/S M. Younas Builders.
  - 3. M/S New Bright Enterprises.
  - 4. M/S Seena Gul Asir.
- 9. The technical proposals of the above eligible bidders were evaluated by the Procuring Committee in light of the Evaluation Criteria given in the Bid Solicitation documents. Evaluation Criteria & Detailed Technical evaluation of individual bidder are attached as **Annex-VI** respectively.

. .

10. The summary of evaluation is tabulated as under:

Sr. No	Name of Firm	Mandatory Requirement (Affidavit of bid security, PEC/code, Enlistment, Active NTN & KPRA)	Experience (35) Obt. Marks	Personnel (15) Obt. Marks	Equipment (20) Obt. Marks	Financial (30) Obt. Marks	Total (100) Obt. Marks	Remarks (Pass/Fail)
2.	M/S M. Younas Builders (Pvt) Ltd.	Passed	21 (>50%)	14 (>50%)	10 (>50%)	25 (>50%)	70.0 (>60)	Pass
3.	M/S New Bright Enterprises.	Passed	0 (<50%)	0 (<50%)	10 (50%)	10 (<50%)	20.0 (<60)	Fail
4.	M/S Seena Gul Asir	Passed	0 (<50%)	0 (<50%)	10 (50%)	05 (<50%)	15.0 (<60)	Fail

- 1. As elucidated from the above, only one bidder i.e. M. Younas Builders (Pvt.) Ltd. technically qualified the criteria.
- 2. The evaluation report is submitted for approval of the competent authority so as to declare the result and open the financial bid of the sole qualified bidder i.e. M. Younas Builders (Pvt.) Ltd., please.

Head Clerk Irrigation & Hydel Division, Khyber.

(Member cum Secretary)

Rep; of Drawing Branch Irrigation & Hydel Division, Khyber.

(Member)

gry for Albun

Sub Divisional Officer,

Bara Sub Division, Khyber.

(Member)

Divisional Accounts Officer Irrigation & Hydel Division,

Khyber.

(Member)

Executive Engineer, igation & Hydel Division,

Khyber.

(Chairman)

Page 3 of 3

Scanned with CamScanner

## EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSALS FOR THE WORK.

Remodeling and Extension of Bara River Canal System, District Khyber.
(ADP / AIP No. 2326/195197/2021-22).
Improvement of canal patrol road on RBC & Minor-G (Package -V)

Bid submission date: 07/12/2021.

- The Notice Inviting E-Bidding on Single Stage Two Envelope procedure of KPPRA Rule for the above works were called through Information Department, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa vide this office letter No. Irr: & HP/Khy/5472/3-T, dated 18/11/2021 for publication in the leading National Daily Newspapers. (Copy attached as Annex-I).
- The Notice Inviting E-Bidding was published in Daily Mashriq Newspaper, Peshawar vide INF(P) 5911/21 and also uploaded on the Irrigation Website. (Copy attached as <u>Annex-II</u>).
- Bid soliciting / bidding documents comprising of evaluation criteria for technical bids were uploaded on the Irrigation Department Website for downloading by the intending bidders.
- Procuring Committee for bid opening and evaluation was constituted vide Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Hydel Power Division, District Khyber office letter No. Irr: & HP/Khy/5313/3-T, dated: 19/11/2021 (Copy attached as Annex-III)
- 5. Sealed Technical and Financial Bids for the above works were submitted by 14 No. Bidders for the subject noted work upto 12:00 noon of 07/12/2021.
- 6. On stipulated date and time in the office of the Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Hydel Power Division, District Khyber i.e. dated 07/12/2021 at 12:30 PM, the technical bids were opened in presence of the contractors and Procuring Committee. The name of the bidder, presence of affidavit of 2% bid security in financial envelop, non-Blacklisting and non-litigation affidavit were announced. (Copy of attendance sheet attached as Annex-IV).

Auran 520

Jan John

John

Page 1 of 3

7. Due to non-submission of affidavit of 2% bid security in the technical bid, 10 No. technical bids were declared ineligible for further evaluation and only 04 No. bidders were considered eligible for further evaluation of the Procuring Committee in light of the technical evaluation criteria as per Bid Soliciting Documents. Detail is as under:

S.No	Name of Firm	No. of copies submitted	Scaled Financial Envelop (Yes/No)	Affidavit of 2% Bid Security. (Yes/No)	Eligible for Technical Evaluation (Yes/No)	
01	M/S Gul Ahmad Afridi	01	Yes	No	No	
02	M/S M. Younas Builder	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
03	M/S New Bright Enterprises	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
04	M/S Watch Construction	01	Yes	No	No	
05	M/S Khalil Construction	01	Yes	No	No	
06	M/S Haq Engineering Co.	01	Yes	No	No	
07	M/S Zeeshan & Roman	01	Yes	No	No	
08	M/S Raz Construction Co.	01	No	No	No	
09	M/S New Bannu Construction	01	Yes	No	No	
10	M/S Gul Builder	01	Yes	No	No	
11	M/S Pir Muhammad & Co.	02	Yes	Yes	Yes	
12	M/S Baz & Haji Construction Co	. 01	Yes	No	No	
13	M/S Seena Gul Asir	01	Yes	Yes	Yes	
14	M/S Maida Gul	01	Yes	No	No	

- 8. The following 04 bidders were declared eligible for further evaluation:
  - 1. M/S Pir Muhammad & Co.
  - 2. M/S M. Younas Builders.
  - 3. M/S New Bright Enterprises.
  - 4. M/S Seena Gul Asir.
- 9. The technical proposals of the above eligible bidders were evaluated by the Procuring Committee in light of the Evaluation Criteria given in the Bid Solicitation documents. Evaluation Criteria & Detailed Technical evaluation of individual bidder are attached as <u>Annex-VI</u> respectively.

Page 2 of 3

Scanned with CamScanner

10. The summary of evaluation is tabulated as under:

Sr. No	Name of Firm	Mandatory Requirement (Affidavit of bid security, PEC/code, Enlistment, Active NTN & KPRA)	Experience (35)	Personnel (15)	Equipment (20)	Financial (30)	Total (100)	Remarks
			Obt. Marks	Obt. Marks	Obt. Marks	Obt. Marks	Obt. Marks	(Pass/Fail)
1.	M/s Pir Muhammad Construction Company.	Passed	26.25 (>50%)	09 (>50%)	3.5 (<50%)	15 (50%)	53.75 (<60)	Fail
2.	M/S M. Younas Builders (Pvt) Ltd.	Passed	24.75 (>50%)	15 (>50%)	10 (>50%)	30 (>50%)	79.75 (>60)	Pass
3.	M/S New Bright Enterprises.	Passed	0 (<50%)	0 (<50%)	10 (50%)	10 (<50%)	20.0 (<60)	Fail
4.	M/S Seena Gul Asir	Passed	0 (<50%)	0 (<50%)	10 (50%)	05 (<50%)	15.0 (<60)	Fail

- 11. As elucidated from the above, only one bidder i.e. M. Younas Builders (Pvt.) Ltd. technically qualified the criteria.
- 12. The evaluation report is submitted for approval of the competent authority so as to declare the result and open the financial bid of the sole qualified bidder i.e. M. Younas Builders (Pvt.) Ltd., please.

Head Clerk Irrigation & Hydel Division,

Khyber. (Member cum Secretary)

Rep, of Drawing Branch Irrigation & Hydel Division, Khyber.

(Member)

Jed for Allin

Sub Divisional Officer,

Bara Sub Division,

Khyber.

(Member)

Divisional Accounts Officer Irrigation & Hydel Division,

Khyber.

(Member)

Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Hydel Division,

Khyber.

(Chairman)

Merged Areas, Irrigation Department,

Scanned with CamScanner

Page 3 of 3