Information on the Award of the Contract under CAREC Corridor 3 Improvement Project Phase 4 (Bishkek–Osh Road,) Performance-based Maintenance Contract. Kara-Balta – Suusamyr section (km 61-km 129.5).

The Ministry of Transport and Roads of the Kyrgyz Republic has completed selection of a contractor for road rehabilitation works and maintains of the road under CAREC Corridor 3 Improvement Project (Bishkek–Osh Road,) Performance-based Maintenance Contract. Kara-Balta – Suusamyr section (km 61-km 129.5).

By the deadline for submission of bids which was May 30, 2017 at 15:00, only 5 companies submitted their bids. At the meeting of the tender committee on May 30, 2017, the technical proposals of the following 5 companies were opened:

Names of the companies who submitted Bid:

Bidder Name	Country
Cakir Yapi Sanayi ve Tic A.S.	Turkey
Top International Engineering Corporation	China
LLC "Mostdorstroi"	Kyrgyz Republic
Consortium "LOI LLC" & "IVETA Co.LLP"	Kyrgyz Republic
LLC "Grant - Start"	Kyrgyz Republic

During the evaluation of technical proposals, the bids of the following participants were found not to be in compliance with the requirements of the tender documentation and were rejected.

were rejected.				
Company Name	Reason for rejection			
Cakir Yapi Sanayi ve Tic A.S.	 Bank Guarantee name of Contract some part is not written fully "Performance Based Maintenance Contract Bishkek-Osh Road: Section Kara Balta-Suusamyr km 61-129 for three years". The experience is based on 2 large works contract, which are seems to be not of similar nature for the key activities. There is evidence of asphalt concrete works, but evidence of maintenance works is not clear. EXP-1 is supported by the Work Experience Certificate which further details are requested with the clarifications. The EXP-2 (2 of 2) states that the bidder performed inside the water project repair on the roads, this could be the case, but there is no clear evidence for this. Method statement seems to be a copy-paste from a large construction contract and has no direct relation with the PBMC works. The section about camp installation shows a construction site camp, but not a maintenance compound. And there are obvious mistakes, like p. 11 that he will carry out in situ piles during winter. Project does not have piles and during winter, the contractor is only expected to clean. There are more examples in the text like this, but this one is very obvious that the bidder didn't clearly understand what is requested. The program is overall acceptable, but quite vague, without details. 			
Тор	1. Form 1 of 4 for EXP-1 & EXP-2 completion date of the Contract is 21th February 2013			
International	therefore does not meet the time requirements set in the bid documents.			
Engineering	2. Form 2 of 4 for EXP-1 & EXP-2 completion date of the Contract is 20th April 2014,			
Corporation	Contract Agreement does not include the Contractor's name and Letter of Acceptance			

is in the name of another Contractor COVEC (China) ltd supported by sub-consultancy
agreement but without Engineer/Employer consent. Bidder asked to specify the similar
works "Asphalt pavement rehabilitation or construction works in the last three years
(Completion of any one section during any one year within the last 3 years) as per each
year. Considering the defect period (typical in works contracts) it seems not possible to
meet the criteria Technical Bid Evaluation Report Page 12 set in bid documents. Bidder
asked to clarify the Relation with the company COVEC (Name exist on the "Letter of
Acceptance" and "Contract Agreement" which the bidder claims that they are co-partner
and which do not have any official Employer/Engineer approval. Despite the specific
clarification request (4th item of 2nd question of the MOTR Letter dated 15.06.2017)
the bidder does not respond on this item. Even the bidder declared in the EXP form that
there is no partner/subcontracting relation. Based on the documents submitted by the
bidder it is clear that the subcontracting (if any) exist this is out of the
Employer/Engineer approval and Contract conditions
3. 44. Form 3 of 4 for EXP-1 & EXP-2 completion date of the Contract is 25th June 2013
and therefore does not meet the time requirements set in the bid documents.
4. 45. Moreover "Shaanxi Huashan Road and Bridge Engineering" company claimed to
be a subsidiary of the bidder but there is no evidence submitted for this statement rather
than an organization chart (even mentioned as Construction Company not engineering
as declared in the clarification) and webpage.
5. Form 4 of 4 for EXP-1 & EXP-2 completion date of the Contract is 15th July 2014;
Contractor name is different than the Bidder name in the Letter of Acceptance. Similar
works requested in Construction Experience in Key activities are also not identified
clearly. The as built project review document submitted does not indicate any similar
works covering the requirement.
6. Lacking of specific experience is considered as a deviation in line with Article 2.7 (f)
& (i) of the ADB guide on Bid Evaluation
7. The schedule is general and quite weak

On October 15, 2017, the financial proposals of following bidders whose proposals met the requirements of the bidding documents were opened.

N⁰	Bidder Name	Bid Price before	Bid Price after
		arithmetic corrections	arithmetic corrections
1	LLC "Mostdorstroi"	296,914,350.00 KGS	296,914,349.28 KGS
2	Consortium "LOI" LLC & "IVETA	350,512,375.00 KGS	350,512,375.00 KGS
	Co." LLP		
3	LLC "Grant - start"	392,723,954.00 KGS	392,723,954.00 KGS

Based on the results of the technical and financial evaluation, LLC "Mostdorstroi" is recognized as the company offered the lowest price and responsive to the requirements of the tender documentation, with the bid price of KGZ 296 914 349.28. Duration of Contract is 36 months.