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CONFIDENTIAL

**Sub:** **Technical Evaluation of Offers received for (Pkg. name with no.) of (Name of project) ……………………………….., , (Plant)**

(TS No. :CET/ ,Month Year)

**1.0** **BACKGROUND**

**1.1** The subject TS was prepared by CET and was subsequently tendered out by (Name of Plant) on ……..vide NIT no ……The scope of work, as specified in the TS, covers ………………………………………. TOD was ………... (in case of TOD extension, final date of TOD to be mentioned)

**1.2** Bids from following ( ) bidders were received by (Name of Plant). Offers were opened on ……… and offers were forwarded to CET for evaluation of technical part vide letter no. …..…. Dated …... .which were received in CET on ……..

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Bidder | Reference no. & date |
| 1. | (Names of bidders to be in alphabetical order)(Same order to be maintained throughout the document) |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |
| 4. | Consortium of..... &. ......(Hereafter referred as ....& Consortium) |  |

**1.3** The technical part of the bids were examined. After examining the bids, certain clarifications/ confirmations were needed for detailed evaluation. Queries for obtaining the clarifications were prepared by CET and submitted to (Name of Plant) / directly to the bidders with copies to Plants on …….. .

**1.4** Clarifications from the bidders were received as indicated below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Bidder | Reference no. & date |
| 1. | (Names of bidders to be in alphabetical order)(Same order to be maintained throughout the document) |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |

**1.5** Subsequently, Tender Discussions were held at ……….. with the ……. bidders as per the following schedule:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Bidder | Date of Tender discussion |
| 1. |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |

The bids were discussed, clarifications provided and agreed points were recorded as MOM during the tender discussions.

**1.5** Subsequently, clarifications/ confirmations on balance points were submitted by the Bidders which was received in CET as indicated below

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl. No. | Bidder | Ref. No. and Date  | Date of receipt in CET |
| 1. |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |

# 1.6 The TER has been prepared based on the above available documents.

**NOTE FOR TFL – If after submission of TER to PFC, further clarification has been sought from bidders, same should be recorded in the background chapter of TER**

# 2.0 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA:

**2.1** The eligibility criteria for Bidders, as specified in the Bid Data Sheet, states the following:

(i) ..................................

(ii) .......................................

(iii) .....................................................

*(Reproduce the eligibility criteria from Bid Data Sheet including financial eligibility)*

# 3.0 ELIGIBILITY of BIDDERS ON TECHNICAL EXPERIENCE:

Based on the offers, subsequent clarifications submitted by the bidders and tender discussions held at ………., the comments/ observations on the technical eligibility w.r.t. points 2.1 (i) & (ii) *(as may be applicable)* are as follows:

## 3.1 BIDDER A

(Give the appraisal point by point as per eligibility criteria)

3.1.1 (Give the specific experience considered as qualifying and why, against each point of eligibility criteria.) [One sample regarding evaluation of technical eligibility is attached at Annexure –A. (Both for consortium bidding as well as sole bidding)]

3.1.2 Based on the above, Bidder A fulfils / does not fulfil the requirement of para 2.1 (i) and (ii)

3.1.3 In view of the above, (Bidder A) is considered technically *eligible / not eligible*.

## 3.2 BIDDER B

(Give the appraisal point by point as per eligibility criteria)

3.2.1 (Give the specific experience considered as qualifying and why, against each point of eligibility criteria.)

3.2.2 Based on the above, Bidder B fulfils / does not fulfil the requirement of para 2.1 (i) and (ii)

3.2.3 In view of the above, (Bidder B) is considered technically *eligible / not eligible*.

## 3.3 BIDDER C

(Give the appraisal point by point as per eligibility criteria)

3.3.1 (Give the specific experience considered as qualifying and why, against each point of eligibility criteria.)

3.3.2 Based on the above, Bidder C fulfils / does not fulfil the requirement of para 2.1 (i) and (ii)

3.3.3 In view of the above (Bidder C) is considered technically *eligible / not eligible*.

# 4.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF BID

The original technical bids referred above, clarifications / confirmations recorded during tender discussion and subsequent clarifications/ confirmations were evaluated by CET. The details of the offers are attached in **Annexure 4.0-1** in form of comparative chart (not applicable for supply TS). The bidder-wise technical appraisals are given below:

## 4.1 BIDDER A

The salient features of the technical bid are as follow:

1. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* scope of work.
2. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* technical specifications.
3. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* performance guarantee
4. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* implementation schedule.
5. *Any other point (If applicable)*

(*The points not confirmed by bidder should be given against each head as above*)

In view of the above, the bid of (Bidder A) is conforming to TS / not conforming to TS.

## 4.2 BIDDER B

The salient features of the technical bid are as follow:

1. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* scope of work.
2. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* technical specifications.
3. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* performance guarantee
4. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* implementation schedule.
5. *Any other point (If applicable)*

(*The points not confirmed by bidder should be given against each head as above*)

In view of the above, the bid of (Bidder B) is conforming to TS / not conforming to TS.

## 4.3 BIDDER C

The salient features of the technical bid are as follow:

1. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* scope of work.
2. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* technical specifications.
3. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* performance guarantee
4. Bidder has confirmed */ not confirmed* implementation schedule.
5. *Any other point (If applicable)*

(*The points not confirmed by bidder should be given against each head as above*)

In view of the above, the bid of (Bidder C) is conforming to TS / not conforming to TS.

 *(All points to be identically numbered for all bidders. The difference can be of “not “ i.e. confirmed or not confirmed. Not confirmed points to be made ITALICS.)*

# 5.0 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Taking into consideration the eligibility on technical experience as well as technical evaluation of bids, the summarised recommendations are given hereunder:

 *(Bidder A)*

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC and the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria and the bid is conforming to TS. Hence the bid is recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC but the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bid is not conforming to TS. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC but the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is not fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC and the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is neither fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria nor is the bid conforming to TS. Hence the bid is not recommended for consideration.

 *(Bidder B)*

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC and the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria and the bid is conforming to TS. Hence the bid is recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC but the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bid is not conforming to TS. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC but the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is not fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC and the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is neither fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria nor is the bid conforming to TS. Hence the bid is not recommended for consideration.

 *(Bidder C)*

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC and the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria and the bid is conforming to TS. Hence the bid is recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is fulfilling the EC but the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bid is not conforming to TS. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration.

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC but the bid is conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is not fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria. Hence, the bid is not recommended for consideration

***If the bidder is not fulfilling the EC and the bid is not conforming to TS*** *-* The bidder is neither fulfilling the Eligibility Criteria nor is the bid conforming to TS. Hence the bid is not recommended for consideration.

**6.0** This technical evaluation has been carried out solely on the basis of documents as received from the bidders. The authenticity of the documents submitted by the bidders have not been verified at our end. The commercial part of bids including financial eligibility/ annual turnover of bidders has also not been evaluated at our end.

# 7.0 SPECIAL ISSUES (if any)

Attention of (Name of Plant) is also drawn to the following:

(Any special issue.)

**If during tender discussions there are changes in scope / clarifications have been provided to remove ambiguity in scope and these have financial implications, then it should be mentioned here for information of the TC**

Tender Committee may kindly look into this aspect.

**8.0** These conclusions / recommendations are for the consideration of Tender Committee of (name of plant)

**Annexure: 4.0-1**

**(Pkg. name with no.) of (Name of project)**

**NIT No. : …, Dtd. ..**

**TS No. : CET/ , Month Year**

**Comparative Chart**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sl. No.** | **Parameters for evaluation** | **Bidder A** | **Bidder B** | **Bidder C** |
| 1. | **Scope of Work**  | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed |
| 2. | **Technical Specifications**  | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed |
| 3. | **Performance Guarantee**  | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed |
| 4. | **Implementation Period**  | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed |
| 5. | **Other point(s) (If any)** | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed | Confirmed/Not Confirmed |

**ANNEXURE-A**

**SAMPLE FOR EVALUATION OF CONSORTIUM BIDDING**

* 1. **M/s BEEKAY ENGINEERING CORPORATION AND CONSORTIUM**
		1. The bidder has submitted the offer as a consortium between M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation and M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd. M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation is the leader of the consortium.
		2. Bidder has submitted a copy of consortium agreement between M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation and M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd., dated 10/12/2015, along with scope matrix. As per responsibility matrix, the role & responsibility of each member are:
* M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation: Detail engineering of Spillage coke conveyors, coal tower conveyors, coke sorting plant equipment and conveyors. Supply of reversing winch, reversing mechanism, charging hole frames and lids, inspection hole frames and lids, ascension pipes, goosenecks, isolation valves, waste heat boxes, electrical equipment, instrumentation & control, automation system, fireclay refractory, insulation refractory and auxiliary refractory etc. Joint responsibility with M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd. forsupply of battery anchorages, doors, door frames and flash plates. Erection of all facilities, dismantling works, assistance in commissioning and PG tests.
* M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd.: Joint responsibility with M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation for supply of battery anchorages, doors, door frames and flash plates. Supply of silica refractory.
	+ 1. Bidder has submitted the following documents in support of their eligibility:
		2. M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation
1. Contract Document No. DGM/EP/TK/2005/200 dated 26/02/2005 for Coke Oven Battery No.5 at Bhilai Steel Plant (BSP) signed between BSP and consortium of CUI of Ukraine, Giprokoks of Ukraine, BEC, BEEKAY & VAI of Finland. COB No.5 of BSP is a 4.3m tall By-Product recovery type battery. Scope of M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation indicates basic and detail engineering of telpher grab bucket for quenching tower, detail engineering of centralized lubrication system, supply of all technological structures including buckstays, tie rods, small anchorage, reversing mechanism, ordinary castings, pipe & fittings, doors, door frames, flash plates, charging hole frame and lids, inspection hole frame and lids, erection of refractories and technological structures and joint responsibility for heating-up & commissioning of battery etc.
2. Approved Billing Schedule No. DGM/(P-PCC)TK/5(352)/2007/2042 dated 12/06/2007 issued by BSP to M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation for equipment supply in the scope of Beekay Engineering Corporation for the above battery at BSP. The billing schedule indicates supply of waste heat box assembly, flash plate, valve box assembly, gooseneck, buckstays etc.
3. Commissioning Certificate No. GM(P)/CZ/COB-5/Comm/2010/849, dated 10/08/2010, issued against above Contract Document by BSP to M/s CUI (leader of Consortium), M/s VAI of Finland, M/s BEEKAY and M/s BEC. As per commissioning certificate, date of completion is mentioned as 05/08/2009.
4. Contract Agreement No. DGM/EP/TK/2006/220 dated 18/02/2006 between BSP and consortium of M/s ESM Group Inc. and M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation for installation of Hot Metal De-sulphurisation Unit (Pkg-3) in SMS-II at BSP. As per the above contract agreement, the scope of M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation covers supply and erection of electrical motors, VVVF motor drives, soft starters, PLC program for ladle car variable speed drive devices, UPS, hardware items including fiber optic based structured cabling system, complete software including communication and interfacing software, SCADA server PC’s, SCADA monitoring code for CCTV system, UPS system, HVAC system, Fire detection and alarm system and standard software to facilitate connection to Level II.
5. Commissioning Certificate No. DGM I/c(P)SZ/ (143)BK/08/1294 dated 16/12/2008 issued by BSP to M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation against the above contract No. DGM/EP/TK/2006/220 dated 18/02/2006 which states that facilities were commissioned on 30/08/2008.

Based on the above, M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation fulfills the requirements of clause No. 2.1 (1.0) (a) & (1) of eligibility criteria.

* + 1. M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd. (SEECL)
1. Signed Contract document No. JSW-VJNR-COKE3-001 dated 19/04/2006 between M/s JSW Steel Ltd. & SEECL for supply of equipment for 1.5 million ton Recovery Coke Oven Project with By-Product Plant. The battery is by-product recovery type with an oven height of 4.3m. Scope of SEECL includes design, engineering, manufacture and supply of equipment including all drawings, documents and associated technical services. Extract of mechanical equipment list submitted indicates door, door frame, flash plates, tie rods, buckstays etc. in the scope of supply of SEECL. Extract of technical specification, which is part of above mentioned contract, indicates supply of refractories including silica refractory in the scope of SEECL.
2. Contract agreement No. JSW-VJNR-COKE3-003 dated 28/08/2006 between M/s JSW Steel Ltd. and SEECL for providing technical services during civil works, erection, testing, commissioning and PG tests related to project for installation of 1.5 million ton recovery coke oven project with By-Product Plant at JSW Plant in Toranagallu.
3. Preliminary Acceptance Certificate (PAC) dated 07/03/2009 issued by JSW Steel Ltd. to M/s SEECL against contract No. JSW-VJNR-COKE3-001 dated 19/04/2006 which states that pursuant to the provisions of the mentioned contract, parties hereto mutually agree and certify successful completion of Preliminary Acceptance Test for Coke Oven No.3. However, as per contract, “Preliminary Acceptance test” means successful completion of cold run test followed by heating of all ovens, successful quenching of 1st push and production of coke of acceptable quality under the guidance of seller and its technicians. *Based on above, it can be inferred that the battery was commissioned*.

Based on the above, M/s Sinosteel Equipment and Engineering Co. Ltd. fulfills the requirements of clause No. 2.1 (1.0) (1) & (2) of eligibility criteria.

* + 1. Based on above documents submitted, it is inferred that the bidder fulfills the requirement of clause No. 2.1 (1.0) of eligibility criteria.
		2. In view of the above, M/s Beekay Engineering Corporation and consortium is considered technically eligible.

**SAMPLE FOR EVALUATION OF SOLE BIDDING**

* 1. **M/s MECON LTD.**
		1. The bidder has submitted the offer as a sole bidder.
		2. Bidder has submitted the following documents in support of their eligibility:-
1. Contract agreement No. P/PROJ/740(1)/79401/08049099, dated 06/08/2008 between RSP and M/s MECON Ltd. for installation of environment friendly, new 7m tall Coke Oven Battery of 67 ovens for by-product recovery type Coke Ovens, at RSP, along with relevant pages of the contract. Scope covers design, engineering, supply, erection, successful commissioning & guarantee tests. Supply includes buckstays, flash plates, waste heat boxes, goose necks and valve box.
2. Commissioning certificate No. DGM(P)UCJ/COB#6/PKG#1/328 dated 02/02/2015 issued by RSP to M/s MECON Ltd. against above contract agreement No. P/PROJ/740(1)/79401/08049099 dated 06/08/2008. Date of completion is 02/02/2015.
	* 1. Based on the above documents submitted, it is concluded that M/s MECON Ltd. fulfills the requirements of Clause No. 2.1 (1.0) (a) of eligibility criteria.

3.2.4 In view of the above, M/s MECON Ltd. is considered technically eligible