

NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

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

No. 6(587)/DIR (P&CA)/NHA/2022//096

Islamabad, December, 2022

Director General

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

Subject:

ANNOUNCEMENT OF EVALUATION REPORT (PPRA RULE-35):
Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study & Detailed Design for
Construction of Jamal Din Interchange on Sukkur-Multan Motorway
(M-5)

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.

(MUHAMMAD AHMED ABRO)
DIRECTOR (CONSULTANCY) P&CA

Encl: Evaluation Report along with Annex- I

Copy for kind information to:

- Member (Planning), NHA, Islamabad;

- General Manager (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 & Detailed Design for Construction of Jamal Din Interchange on Sukkur-Multan Motorway (M-5)
4.	Tender Inquiry No.:	6(587)
5.	PPRA Ref. No. (TSE):	TS492961E
6.	Date & Time of Bid Closing:	10 th November, 2022 at 1130 hours local time
7.	Date & Time of Bid Opening:	10 th November, 2022 at 1200 hours local time
8.	No of Bids Received:	Six (06) 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 Associated Consultancy Centre (Pvt.) Ltd. in association with M/s ZK Enterprises (Sub- Consultant)	812	Technically Qualified			
2)	M/s Associated Consulting Engineers ACE Ltd. in association with M/s National Infrastructure Engineering Services (NIES) (Sub- Consultant)	808	Technically Qualified			
3)	M/s NESPAK (Pvt.) Ltd. in association with M/s Power Aim Engineering Services (Pvt.) Ltd. (Sub-Consultant)	803	Technically Qualified			
4)	M/s Prime Engineering & Testing Consultants (Pvt.) Ltd. and in association with M/s ZTECH Tech. Engineering Solutions (Sub-Consultant)	766	Technically Qualified			
5)	M/s PAVRON in JV with M/s BK Consultant (SMC-Pvt.) Ltd. and in association with M/s Engineering &	753	Technically Qualified			

Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study & Detailed Design for Construction of Jamal Din Interchange on Page 1 of 2 Sukkur-Multan Motorway (M-5)

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.
Technical Associates (Sub-Consultant)		
6) M/s Asif Ali & Associates in JV with M/s A.A Associates & and in association with M/s Concept Planning & Engineering Services (Sub-Consultant)	738	Technically Qualified

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 Document

ocuments (SBD)

National Highway Authority



Annex-I

Criteria

FOR

Bid Evaluation

Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study & Detailed Design for Construction of Jamal Din Interchange on Sukkur-Multan Motorway (M-5)

December, 2022

SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET FOR FULL TECHNICAL PROPOSALS (QCBS)

	Max.	Firm 1		Fin	n 2
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weightage	Rating	Score	Rating	Score
1. Firms Experience	100				-32
General Experience in road Transport Sector	25				
Specific Experience related to particular Assignment	75				
	250				
2. A pproach and Methodology 2-a. Anoreciation of the Project	70				
(i) Evidence of Site Visit with Photographs	(30)				
(i) Chaits of convenieties	(20)				
(ii) Clarity of appreciation	(20)	X			
(iii) Comprehensiveness of appreciation 2-b. Problem Statement/ understanding of objectives	50				
(i) Identification of Problems/ Objectives	(30)				
	(20)				
(ii) Components of Proposed Services	80				
2-c. Methodology (i) Proposed Solutions for this Project	(30)		7 1		198
(ii) Quality of Methodology	(20)				
(ii) Conciseness, clarity and completeness of proposal	(30)				
2-d. Suggested Changes for Improvement in TOR	10				
2-d. Suggested Changes for Improvement in Tok	20				
	20				
2-f. Staffing Schedule	450				
3. Key Personnel	25				
Firm affidavit for presence of personnel	125	I		1	
i. Team Leader/ Senior Highway Engineer	100				
ii. Structural Engineer	75				
iii. Pavement Engineer	75				
iv. Transport Economist	50		TIC.		
v. Quantity Surveyor	75				
4. Performance Certification from clients	25				
Affidavit on stamp paper duly attested by the Oath Commissioner regarding non-blacklisting	59				T
5. Present Commitments (current engagement and available strength - justification)	50	-	-		
6. Transfer of Knowledge (Methodology/ Plans) TOTAL:	1000	-	-		1
TOTAL	1000				nd-

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)	
(Show all experts to be evaluated)		Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (A)	Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (B)	Percentage Rating	Weighted Rating (C)	(A+B+C)	
i. Team Leader/ Senior Highway Engineer									
ii. Structural Engineer									
iii. Pavement Engineer									
iv. Transport Economist						N FIRST R	310	N. C.	
v. Quantity Surveyor						1 4			

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%.

