

राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग एवं अवसंरचना विकास निगम लिमिटेड

सड़क परिवहन और राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार
प्रथम तल, टावर ए, वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर, नौरोजी नगर, नई दिल्ली-110029,

National Highways & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Government of India

First Floor, Tower A, World Trade Centre, Nauroji Nagar, New Delhi-110029, Tel: +91 11 26768950, www.nhidcl.com



(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

(A Government of India Enterprise)

NHIDCL/Procurement/Meghalaya/2023-24/3069

Date: 22.04.2026

To,

All Bidders,

Sub: Consultancy Services for Preparation of Feasibility Study and Detailed Project Report for Construction of 4-Lane with Paved Shoulder from Phulbari (Meghalaya) to Shillong in the State of Meghalaya-Result of Technical Evaluation- Reg.

Ref: NHIDCL/Meghalaya/Phulbari-Shillong/DPR/2025

Tender Id: 2025_NHIDC_883828_1

Please refer to your bid submitted for the subject cited above. The following is the final result of technical evaluation:

Summary of evaluation of Technical Proposals								
Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Firm's relevant experience	Material testing, survey & investigation, equipment and software	Qualification and Relevant experience of the proposed key personnel	Total marks	Responsiveness	Local Content Status	Remarks
	Maximum Marks	50	10	40	100			
1.	M/s URS Scott Wilson India Private Limited in JV with M/s Artefact Projects Limited	33.00	5.50	33.98	72.48	Non-Responsive	Non-Local Supplier	- As per clause 1.8.2, 3.1.3, 5.1 (vii) & 5.2 of RFP. - SA Certificate not submitted along with Project name/ Tender ID.
2.	M/s Almondz Global Infra Consultant Limited in JV with M/s Ekam Venture in Association with M/s CivilEdge Infra Consultancy Private Limited	24.00	6.50	35.50	66.00	Non-Responsive	Non-Local Supplier	- As per clause 1.8.2, 3.1.3, 5.1 (vii), 5.2 & 12.1 (ii) of RFP. - SA Certificate not submitted along with Project name/ Tender ID.
3.	M/s Monarch Surveyors and Engineering Consultants Limited in Association with M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	34.50	6.50	37.45	78.45	Non-Responsive	Class-I Local Supplier	As per clause 1.8.2, 3.1.3, 5.1 (vii), 5.2, 11 (a) (ii), 11 (b), 11 (c) of RFP.
4.	M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s Transys Consulting Pvt. Ltd. in Association with M/s Upham International Corporation	49.00	6.50	37.41	92.91	Responsive	Non-Local Supplier	- Eligible for opening of financial bid. - SA Certificate not submitted along with

Summary of evaluation of Technical Proposals								
Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Firm's relevant experience	Material testing, survey & investigation, equipment and software	Qualification and Relevant experience of the proposed key personnel	Total marks	Responsiveness	Local Content Status	Remarks
	Maximum Marks	50	10	40	100			
								Project name/ Tender ID
5.	M/s K&J Projects Private Limited	34.00	6.50	30.40	70.90	Non-Responsive	Non-Local Supplier	- As per clause 3.1.3, 5.1 (vii) & 5.2 of RFP. - SA Certificate not submitted along with Project name/ Tender ID.

Note: If any bidder of foreign origin or any bidder who has proposed foreign key personnel, emerges as H1 bidder, National Security Clearance will be sought by NHIDCL from Govt of India/MoRTH prior awarding the assignment. In case the H1 bidder is denied the security clearance, for whatsoever reasons, then the combined technical and financial scores of remaining eligible Bidders shall be re-assessed, and first ranked bidder shall be awarded the assignment, subject to security clearance, if required. In the event of non-availability of another eligible Bidder, the bid process shall be annulled and fresh bids invited.

2. The bidders are requested to submit their representation, if any, within 07 days as per Cl. 12.3 of Data Sheet of RFP (i.e., on or before 28.04.2026) from the date of uploading of result.


 22.04.2026
 Subodh Kumar
 General Manager (Tech.)

Annexure

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
1.	M/s URS Scott Wilson India Private Limited in JV with M/s Artefact Projects Limited	1. The bidder has not mentioned delineation of duties/responsibility of the Lead/Associate members in the MoU as required under CI 1.8.2 of Lol of RFP. 2. Local Content Certificate: Both Lead and JV member have not submitted local content certificate from statutory auditor. 3. Technical Capacity criteria: For other member, no highway professionals assessed to be working with the firm. Submitted Form-26AS are having details either (i) for less than one year with the respective firms or (ii) for period 6 months prior to the bid due date [which is required as shown in sample illustration under clause 3.1.3 (v)]. 4. Firm is not having adequate experience in Aggregate Length of DPR / Feasibility study of 2/4/6 lane projects required for claimed marks. 5. Firm is not having adequate experience in DPR/FS for 2/4/6 laning projects each equal to or more than 40% / 60% of indicative length required for claimed marks. 6. 19 out of 96 highway professionals are found to be working with the firm as per INFRACON details and 26AS. Remaining Professional details are beyond 6 months prior the bid due date as such current employment is not certified. 7. Quality of Past Performance (Self-Certification) is not traceable in the technical proposal. 8. Required testing facilities (Field Investigation, and Office Equipment & Software) are not readily identifiable from the list enclosed in the technical bid. Also, ownership documents for Material Testing Facilities and Field Investigation Facilities are not traceable in the technical proposal. 9. Proposed Team Leader cum Highway Engineer is not having adequate experience in Highway Projects-Experience in Planning, project preparation and design of Highway Projects (2/4/6 laning of NH/SH/Expressways) for claimed marks. 10. Proposed Bridge Engineer is not having adequate experience in BRIDGE PROJECTS-Experience in PROJECT PREPARATION AND DESIGN OF BRIDGE PROJECTS for claimed marks. Further KP is not having adequate experience as SENIOR BRIDGE ENGINEER OR SIMILAR CAPACITY in HIGHWAY DESIGN CONSULTANCY PROJECTS (2/4/ laning of NH/SH/Expressways) involving design of Major Bridges (minimum 2 nos. of length more than 200m) for claimed marks.
2.	M/s Almondz Global Infra Consultant Limited in JV with M/s Ekam Venture in Association with M/s CivilEdge Infra Consultancy Private Limited	1. The bidder has not mentioned delineation of duties/responsibility of the Lead/Associate members in the MoU as required under CI 1.8.2 of Lol of RFP. 2. The bidder has not mentioned JV member's name in the Integrity Pact. 3. Local Content Certificate: Lead member has submitted local content certificate from statutory auditor in which Project name/Tender ID is not mentioned and both JV member & Associate member has not submitted local content certificate from statutory auditor. 4. Technical Capacity criteria: For lead member, no highway professionals assessed to be working with the firm. Submitted Form-26AS are having details either (i) for less than one year with the respective firms or (ii) for period 6 months prior to the bid due date [which is required as shown in sample illustration under clause 3.1.3 (v)]. For other member, Form-T11 is not traceable in the technical bid. Also, no highway professionals assessed to be working with the firm. Submitted Form-26AS are having details either (i) for less than one year with the respective firms or (ii) for period 6 months prior to the bid due date [which is required as shown in sample illustration under clause 3.1.3 (v)].

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
		5. The other member of JV is not meeting the minimum required aggregate length indicative to the project length as per clause 12.1 (ii) of Data Sheet. Other member has claimed 08 projects having experience in DPR/Feasibility Study cum Preliminary Design Report, out of which, 5 projects have been considered for evaluation, further out of which, for three projects (at sr. no. 1, 2 and 4), only 4-lane part is considered for evaluation and 2-lane part is not considered, as the consultancy fee is less than Rs one crore. Remaining three projects are not considered for reasons that the date of completion is not mentioned in the experience certificate, consultancy fee is either not mentioned or is less than 1 cr. (in case of 2 lane projects). Also, both the JV members are not meeting the minimum requirement of having at least one single project of DPR of minimum 40% length or one single project of Feasibility Study of minimum 60% length as per clause 12.1 (ii) of Data Sheet of RFP. Claimed projects are not meeting the criteria of single project. Reasons for non-consideration of projects are either date of completion not mentioned in the experience certificate, or JV/Association share not mentioned in experience certificate, or some DPR projects are completed up to feasibility report only, or only draft DPR submitted, or for 2-lane projects, consultancy fee is not mentioned/less than 1 cr. or project is not highway project. 6. Firm is not having adequate experience in Aggregate Length of DPR / Feasibility study of 2/4/6 lane projects required for claimed marks. 7. Firm is not having adequate experience in DPR/FS for 2/4/6 laning projects each equal to or more than 40% / 60% of indicative length required for claimed marks. 8. Firm has claimed 18 projects for the criteria of having more than 200 mtr bridge experience, as such 04 projects are considered, remaining 14 projects are not considered either the project is not having 200 mtr bridge or projects claimed are of supervision/feasibility in nature or some projects are executed as Associate which are not meeting the requirement of 200 mtr length or date of completion is not mentioned in the experience certificate. 9. Firm is not having adequate annual average turnover in last five years for claimed marks. 10. 03 out of 113 highway professionals are found to be working with the firm as per INFRACON details and 26AS. Remaining Professional details are beyond 6 months prior the bid due date as such current employment is not certified or are under discrepancy on INFRACON Portal. 11. Required testing facilities (Field Investigation, and Office Equipment & Software) are not readily identifiable from the list enclosed in the technical bid. 12. Proposed Bridge Engineer is not having adequate experience in TOTAL PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE. Further, the KP is not having adequate experience in BRIDGE PROJECTS- Experience in PROJECT PREPARATION AND DESIGN OF BRIDGE PROJECTS. 13. Proposed Highway Engineer is not having adequate experience in TOTAL PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE for claimed marks. Further, KP is not having adequate experience in SIMILAR CAPACITY- IN DESIGN/ PAVEMENT DESIGN OF HIGHWAY PROJECTS (2/4/6 laning of NH/SH/Expressways) in Similar Capacity (Minimum aggregate length 80 km) for claimed marks.
3.	M/s Monarch Surveyors and Engineering Consultants Limited in Association with M/s Rodic Consultants Pvt. Ltd.	1. The bidder has not mentioned delineation of duties/responsibility of the Lead/Associate members in the MoU as required under CI 1.8.2 of Lol of RFP. 2. Technical Capacity criteria: The bidder in its submission for technical capacity has not claimed its ongoing assignments in NHIDCL. Also, no highway professionals are assessed to be working with the firm. Submitted Form-26AS are having details either (i) for less than one year with the

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
		respective firms or (ii) for period 6 months prior to the bid due date [which is required as shown in sample illustration under clause 3.1.3 (v)]. 3. Firm is not having adequate experience in Aggregate Length of DPR / Feasibility study of 2/4/6 lane projects required for claimed marks. 4. Firm is not having adequate experience in DPR/FS for 2/4/6 laning projects each equal to or more than 40% / 60% of indicative length required for claimed marks. 5. Firm has claimed 11 projects for the criteria of having more than 200 mtr bridge experience, as such 02 projects are considered, remaining 09 projects are not considered either the project is not having 200 mtr bridge or projects are not executed in DPR nature or some projects are executed as Associate/JV which are not meeting the requirement of 200 mtr length or only draft DPR submitted or completed up to Final Feasibility Report. 6. 10 out of 63 highway professionals are found to be working with the firm as per INFRACON details and 26AS. Remaining Professional details are beyond 6 months prior the bid due date as such current employment is not certified or are under discrepancy on INFRACON Portal. 7. Self-Certification for Average area variation as percentage of acquired private land as per 1st 3D notification in last 5 DPRs prepared by the firm is not traceable in the technical proposal. 8. Required testing facilities (Field Investigation, and Office Equipment & Software) are not readily identifiable from the list enclosed in the technical bid. 9. Proposed Bridge Engineer is not having adequate experience as SENIOR BRIDGE ENGINEER OR SIMILAR CAPACITY in HIGHWAY DESIGN CONSULTANCY PROJECTS (2/4/ laning of NH/SH/Expressways) involving design of Major Bridges (minimum 2 nos. of length more than 200m) for claimed marks.
4.	M/s SA Infrastructure Consultants Pvt. Ltd. in JV with M/s Transys Consulting Pvt. Ltd. in Association with M/s Upham International Corporation	1. Local Content Certificate: All members have submitted local content certificate from statutory auditor in which Project name/Tender ID is not mentioned. 2. 25 out of 69 highway professionals are found to be working with the firm as per INFRACON details and 26AS. Remaining Professional details are beyond 6 months prior the bid due date as such current employment is not certified or are under discrepancy on INFRACON Portal. 3. Required testing facilities (Field Investigation, and Office Equipment & Software) are not readily identifiable from the list enclosed in the technical bid. 4. Proposed Team Leader cum Highway Engineer is not having adequate experience in HIGHWAY PROJECTS-Experience in PLANNING, PROJECT PREPARATION AND DESIGN OF HIGHWAY PROJECTS (2/4/6 laning of NH/SH/Expressways) for claimed marks. 5. Proposed Bridge Engineer is not having adequate experience as SENIOR BRIDGE ENGINEER OR SIMILAR CAPACITY in HIGHWAY DESIGN CONSULTANCY PROJECTS (2/4/ laning of NH/SH/Expressways) involving design of Major Bridges (minimum 2 nos. of length more than 200m) for claimed marks. 6. Proposed Highway Engineer is not having adequate experience in TOTAL PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE for claimed marks. Further, KP is not having adequate experience in HIGHWAY PROJECTS - Experience in DESIGN/ PAVEMENT DESIGN OF HIGHWAY PROJECTS (2/4/6 laning of NH/SH/Expressways) for claimed marks.
5.	M/s K&J Projects Private Limited	1. Local Content Certificate: The bidder has not submitted local content certificate from statutory auditor. 2. Technical Capacity criteria: No highway professionals assessed to be working with the firm. Submitted Form-26AS are having details either (i) for less than one year with the respective firms or (ii) for period 6 months prior to the bid due date [which is required as shown in sample illustration under clause 3.1.3 (v)].

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
		3. Firm is not having adequate experience in Aggregate Length of DPR / Feasibility study of 2/4/6 lane projects required for claimed marks. 4. 05 out of 36 highway professionals are found to be working with the firm as per INFRACON details and 26AS. Remaining Professional details are beyond 6 months prior the bid due date as such current employment is not certified. 5. Required testing facilities (Field Investigation, and Office Equipment & Software) are not readily identifiable from the list enclosed in the technical bid. 6. Proposed Traffic/Road Signage /Marking and Safety Expert- verification status of the KP is unsuccessful (insufficiency) as per INFRACON Profile. Hence, not considered for evaluation.