

## EVALUATION REPORT

(As Per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004)

1. Name of Procuring Agency: Karachi Infrastructure Development Company Ltd. (KIDCL).  
Ministry of Communications. Government of Pakistan.
2. Method of Procurement: Single-Stage Two Envelopes under Rule 36(b) Public (QCBS Method).
3. Title of Procurement: **CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR PLANNING, DESIGNING AND CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION FOR ROADS, BRIDGES, UNDERPASS AND RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE Karachi Package.**
4. Tender Inquiry No: TS336630E
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 5. PPRA Ref. No (TSE):  | TS336630E   |
| 6. Date & Time of Bid Closing:  | 28 <sup>th</sup> Dec , 2017 at 1500 Hrs<br>20 <sup>th</sup> Dec , 2017 at 1500 Hrs (Original)   |
| 7. Date & Time of Technical Bid Opening:<br>Date & Time of Financial Bid Opening: | 28 <sup>th</sup> Dec , 2017 at 1530 Hrs (Extended)<br>22 <sup>nd</sup> January, 2018 at 03:30pm |
| 8. No. of Bids Received'  | Four (04)   |
9. Criteria for Bid Evaluation. Evaluation criteria already provided in the bidding documents. Evaluation criterion is reproduced below for Reference.

### Evaluation/Qualification Criteria

The evaluation of technical proposal shall be based on the following criteria:

No.	Description / Items	Max. Marks
i.	<b>Financial soundness</b>	<b><u>100</u></b>
	<b>Firm's Experience</b>	<b><u>400</u></b>
	- General Experience	100
	- * Specific Experience	300
ii.	i) bridges / flyovers/underpasses	80
	ii) road infrastructure /S.W drain	150
	iii) water supply / sewerage/ CETP	70
	<b>* Approach &amp; Methodology with Presentation</b>	<b><u>50</u></b>
	- Understanding of objectives	7
	- Quality of Methodology	15
	- Innovativeness	7
iii.	- Work Program	7
	- Facilities proposed for the assignment	7
	- Conciseness, Clarity, and Completeness in proposal preparation	7
iv.	<b>** Personnel (Area of Expertise) Qualification and Competence of Key Proposed Staff</b>	<b><u>300</u></b>
	- Personnel at Design Stage	120



- Personnel at Construction Supervision Stage	180	
v. Present Commitment		<u>100</u>
vi. Past Performance of the Consultant in last three assignments of comparable magnitudes		<u>50</u>
	<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>1000</b>

\* For Specific Experience and Approach / Methodology, Evaluation Marks for Design would be 35%; and Evaluation Marks for Supervision would be 65%.

10. Thirteen (13) firms purchased Tender Documents. Four bidders submitted Sealed bids.

**The bidders who submitted sealed Bid on the Closing date**

1. M/s NESPAK
2. M/S Techno Consult
3. M/s AA. Associates-ECIL-NAA
4. M/s ESS.I.AAR

**The Unqualified bidders and Reasons for failure to disqualify.**

	Name of Bidder	Reasons for Failure to Qualify The Technical Proposals
1	M/s. ESS.I.AAR	Failed due to the following reason. While Calculating Technical Requirement Mentioned at para 5.2 Technical proposal (5.2.1) in given RFP M/s ESS.I.AAR has Secured less than 70% (Passing/qualifying) Marks.

**The Qualified bidders**

Ranking	Name of Bidders	Technical Score (St)	Financial Score Sf= (1000xm) /F	Combined Score S =St x T% + Sf x P% T=75% P=25%	Quoted Price (Inclusive of all taxes)	Evaluated Cost (PKR) Inclusive of all taxes.	Rule/Regulation BD*/ Policy Basis for / Rejection/ Acceptance as per Rule35 PP Rules,2004
1st	A.A. Associates-ECIL-NAA	957.5	1000	968.125	161,980,844	162,959,624	Meeting All Criteria
2nd	Techno Consult	965	928.7	955.925	174,965,000	175,464,988	Meeting All Criteria
3rd	NESPAK	970.50	661.75	893.305	191,173,100	246,252,416	Meeting All Criteria

**Highest Ranked Bidder: M/s AA. Associates-ECIL-NAA**

11. Any other additional/supporting information. the procuring agency may like to share: NIL

Signature & Official Stamp.....

