

NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

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

No. 6(588)/DIR/III/NHA/2022/1025

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 and Detailed Design for Construction of an Interchange at (M-3) Abdul Hakeem Motorway at Esaan, Sharaqpur District Sheikhupura 20 KM from M-2

Reference: PPRA Rule-35

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 to:

Member (Planning), NHA, Islamabad;

Director (Tech. to Chairman), NHA, Islamabad;

Dy. Director Consultancy (P&CA), NHA, Islamabad;

National Highway Authority



Annex-I
Criteria
FOR

Bid Evaluation

Consultancy Services for Feasibility Study and Detailed Design for Construction of an Interchange at (M-3) Abdul Hakeem Motorway at Esaan, Sharaqpur District Sheikhupura 20 KM from M-2

December, 2022

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 an Interchange at (M-3) Abdul Hakeem Motorway at Esaan, Sharaqpur District Sheikhupura 20 KM from M-2
4.	Tender Inquiry No.:	6(588)
5.	PPRA Ref. No. (TSE):	TS490138E
6.	Date & Time of Bid Closing:	10th October, 2022 at 1130 hours local time
7.	Date & Time of Bid Opening:	10th October, 2022 at 1200 hours local time
8.	No of Bids Received:	Three (03) 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

			Marks			Rule/Regulation/ SBD**/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.		
	Name of Bidder	Technical Score (St) 80%	Financial Score (Sf) 20%	Total Score 100%	Evaluated Cost (EC)* (PKR)			
1)	M/s NESPAK (Pvt.) Ltd in association with M/s Power Aim Engineering Services (Pvt). (Sub- Consultant)	670	195	865	9,114,750	Top scoring firm in combined evaluation (PPRA Rule 36(b) (ix))		
2)	M/s Associated Consultancy Centre (Pvt.) Ltd. in association with M/s Technical Associates Peshawar (Sub Consultant)	652	190	842	9,366,919	2 nd		
3)	M/s Asif Ali Associate (Pvt) Ltd, in JV with M/s A.A Associates and in association with M/s Concept Planning and Engineering Services (Sub Consultant)	624	200	824	8,897,957	3 rd		

EVALUATION REPORT

(As Per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)

*EC is the Evaluated Cost used for evaluation purpose and includes only the cost of competitive component (i.e. Remuneration and Direct Non-Salary Cost) and is exclusive of Provisional Sum, Contingency and Indirect Taxes.

Top Ranked Bidder:

M/s NESPAK (Pvt.) Ltd in association with M/s Power Aim

Engineering Services (Pvt). (Sub-Consultant)

11. Any other additional/supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share: The Procurement was carried out in line with PPRA Rules & Regulations. The bidding was done on QCBS method with 80:20 Technical to Financial Proposals ratio. The Contract is being awarded to M/s NESPAK (Pvt.) Ltd in association with M/s Power Aim Engineering Services (Pvt). (Sub-Consultant) at evaluated financial proposal of Pak. Rs. 9,114,750/-

Signature:...

Official Stamp:

**Standard Bidding Documents (SBD).

SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET FOR FULL TECHNICAL PROPOSALS (QCBS)

	Max.	- Fin	n 1	Fin	m 2
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weightage	Rating	Score	Rating	Score
. Firms Experience	100				
General Experience in road Transport Sector	25				
Specific Experience related to particular Assignment	75				
2. Approach and Methodology	250				
2-a. Appreciation of the Project	<u>70</u>				
(i) Evidence of Site Visit with Photographs	(30)			<u> </u>	
(ii) Clarity of appreciation	(20)				
(iii) Comprehensiveness of appreciation	(20)				
2-b. Problem Statement/ understanding of objectives	<u>50</u>				ļ
(i) Identification of Problems/ Objectives	(30)				
(ii) Components of Proposed Services	(20)				·
2-c. Methodology	<u>80</u>				7,77
(i) Proposed Solutions for this Project	(30)				
(ii) Quality of Methodology	(20)			<u> </u>	
(iii) Conciseness, clarity and completeness of proposal	(30)			<u> </u>	
2-d. Suggested Changes for Improvement in TOR	<u>10</u>			<u> </u>	ļ
2-e. Work Program	<u>20</u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>
2-f. Staffing Schedule	<u>20</u>				
. Key Personnel	450				
Firm affidavit for presence of personnel	25				<u> </u>
i. Team Leader/Senior Highway Engineer	120				
ii. Senior Structural/Bridge Engineer	100				
iii. Pavement & Drainage Engineer	_60				
iv. Hydrologist / Hydraulics Engineer	65				
v. Transport Economist	50				
vi. Quantity Surveyor	30	1.0			
. Performance Certification from clients	75				
Affidavit on stamp paper duly attested by the Oath Commissioner regarding non-blacklisting	25		Z HI		
5. Present Commitments (current engagement and available strength - justification)	50			181	
o. Transfer of Knowledge (Methodology/ Plans)	50	1.5	Z	ई	
TOTAL:	1000		[*/\	2CP /*/	

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*		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. Senior Structural/Bridge Engineer									
iii. Pavement & Drainage Engineer									
iv. Hydrologist/Hydraulics Engineer	1								
v. Transport Economist									
vi. Quantity Surveyor									

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%.

*The Key Professional Staff whose duration is less than six (6) months/ available for the assignment/ associates/ part time available for the assignment, in such cases status with the firm marks shall not be allocated.



