



# NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

Procurement & Contract Administration Section  
28-Mauve Area, G-9/1, Islamabad Tel: 9032727, Fax: 9260419

No. 6(578)/GM/(P&CA)/NHA/2022/6/3

Islamabad, 26. October, 2022

## Director General

Public Procurement Regulatory Authority  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor FBC Building near State Bank,  
Sector G-5/2, Islamabad

Subject: **ANNOUNCEMENT OF EVALUATION REPORT (PPRA RULE-35):  
Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study and Detailed Design  
for Construction of Lundianwala Interchange on Lahore-Abdul  
Hakeem Motorway (M-3)**

Reference: PPRA Rule-35

Find enclosed herewith the Evaluation Report along with Evaluation Criteria (Annex-I) for the subject Services in line with PPRA Rule-35 for uploading on PPRA website at the earliest, please.

  
(SAMI-UR-REHMAN)  
General Manager (P&CA)

**Encl:** Evaluation Report along with **Annex- I**

### **Copy for kind information to:**

- Member (Planning), NHA, Islamabad;
- Director Consultancy (P&CA), NHA, Islamabad;
- Director (Tech. to Chairman), NHA, Islamabad;

# EVALUATION REPORT

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

1.	Name of Procuring Agency:	National Highway Authority
2.	Method of Procurement:	Single Stage Two Envelope Procedure
3.	Title of Procurement:	Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study and Detailed Design for Construction of Lundianwala Interchange on Lahore-Abdul Hakeem Motorway (M-3)
4.	Tender Inquiry No.:	6(578)
5.	PPRA Ref. No. (TSE):	TS485511E
6.	Date & Time of Bid Closing:	12 <sup>th</sup> August, 2022 at 1130 hours local time
7.	Date & Time of Bid Opening:	12 <sup>th</sup> August, 2022 at 1200 hours local time
8.	No of Bids Received:	Eight (08) Proposals were received
9.	Criteria for Bid Evaluation:	Criteria of Bid Evaluation is attached at Annex-I
10.	Details of Bid(s) Evaluation:	As below

Name of Bidder	Technical Score (out of 1000)	Rule/Regulation/ SBD**/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
1) M/s Asif Ali & Associates (Pvt.) Ltd. In association with M/s Concept Planning & Engineering Services	799	Technically Qualified
2) M/s Associated Consultancy Centre (Pvt.) Ltd. in association with M/s Technical Associates	792	Technically Qualified
3) M/s Associated Consulting Engineers (ACE) Ltd. in association with M/s Pakistan Engineering Tech.	782	Technically Qualified
4) M/s NESPAK (Pvt.) Ltd. in JV with M/s Technical Resource Services (Pvt.) Ltd. and in association with M/s NGE Consultants (Pvt.) Ltd.	758	Technically Qualified
5) M/s A.A Associates in association with M/s Global Engineering System	740	Technically Qualified
6) M/s Allied Engineering Consultants (Pvt.) Ltd.	527	Technically Dis-Qualified (Less than 70%.) PPRA Rule 36(b) (v)
7) M/s PAVRON in JV with M/s BK Consultant (SMC-PVT) Ltd. and in		Non-Responsive Data Sheet of the RFP (LOI Clause 1.8 (iv))


*b*


# EVALUATION REPORT

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

Name of Bidder	Technical Score (out of 1000)	Rule/Regulation/ SBD**/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
association with M/s National Infrastructure Engineering Services		
8) M/s Engineering Services and Architecture Consultants (ESAC)		Non-Responsive Data Sheet of the RFP (LOI Clause 1.8 (iv))

11. **Any other additional/supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share:**  
 The Procurement is being carried out in line with PPRA Rules & Regulations using the QCBS method with 80:20 Technical to Financial Proposals ratio.

Signature: 

Official Stamp: 

**\*\*Standard Bidding Documents (SBD).**



# **National Highway Authority**



**Annex-I**

**Criteria**

*FOR*

**Bid Evaluation**

**Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study  
and Detailed Design for Construction of  
Lundianwala Interchange on Lahore-Abdul  
Hakeem Motorway (M-3)**

**October, 2022**

## SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET FOR FULL TECHNICAL PROPOSALS (QCBS)

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Max. Weightage	Firm 1		Firm 2	
		Rating	Score	Rating	Score
<b>1. Firms Experience</b>	<b>100</b>				
General Experience in road Transport Sector	25				
Specific Experience related to particular Assignment	75				
<b>2. Approach and Methodology</b>	<b>250</b>				
2-a. <i>Appreciation of the Project</i>	70				
(i) Evidence of Site Visit with Photographs	(30)				
(ii) Clarity of appreciation	(20)				
(iii) Comprehensiveness of appreciation	(20)				
2-b. <i>Problem Statement/ understanding of objectives</i>	50				
(i) Identification of Problems/ Objectives	(30)				
(ii) Components of Proposed Services	(20)				
2-c. <i>Methodology</i>	80				
(i) Proposed Solutions for this Project	(30)				
(ii) Quality of Methodology	(20)				
(iii) Conciseness, clarity and completeness of proposal	(30)				
2-d. <i>Suggested Changes for Improvement in TOR</i>	10				
2-e. <i>Work Program</i>	20				
2-f. <i>Staffing Schedule</i>	20				
<b>3. Key Personnel</b>	<b>450</b>				
Firm affidavit for presence of personnel	25				
i. Team Leader/ Highway Engineer	200				
ii. Structural Engineer	105				
iii. Pavement Engineer	60				
iv. Transport Economist	60				
<b>4. Performance Certification from clients</b>	<b>75</b>				
Affidavit on stamp paper duly attested by the Oath Commissioner regarding non-blacklisting	25				
<b>5. Present Commitments (current engagement and available strength – justification)</b>	<b>50</b>				
<b>6. Transfer of Knowledge (Methodology/ Plans)</b>	<b>50</b>				
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1000</b>				

Excellent - 100%. Very Good - 90-99% Above Average - 80-89% Average - 70-79% Below Average - 1-69% Non-complying - 0%,

Score: Maximum Weightage rating / 100. Minimum qualifying score is 70% or 700 marks.



## PERSONNEL EVALUATION SHEET

POSITION / AREA OF EXPERTISE	Name	Academic and General Qualification Weightage 30%		Project related Experience Weightage 60%		Status with the Firm 10%		OVERALL RATING (Sum of Weighted Ratings)
		Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (A)	Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (B)	Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (C)	(A+B+C)
(Show all experts to be evaluated)								
i. Team Leader/ Highway Engineer								
ii. Structural Engineer								
iii. Pavement Engineer								
iv. Transport Economist								

Rating: - Excellent - 100%    Very good - 90-99%    Above Average - 80-89%    Average - 70-79%    Below Average - 1-69%    Non-complying - 0%

Score: Maximum Weightage X rating / 100. Minimum qualifying score is 70%.

