सत्यमेव जयते

No. RW/NH-33044/29/2021-S&R(P&B) Part (Comp No 248404)
Government of India
Ministry of Road Transport & Highways
Transport Bhawan, 1, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001

Dated 29th September, 2025

To,

1. Principal Secretaries / Secretaries of all States/ UTs Public Works Department dealing with National Highways.
2. All Engineer-in-Chief and Chief Engineers of Public Works Departments of States/ UTs dealing with National Highways.
3. The Chairman, National Highways Authority of India
4. The Managing Director, NHIDCL
5. The Director General (Border Roads)

Sub: Rating of DPR Consultants on National Highways Projects - Reg

Sir,

In order to assess the actual performance of DPR Consultancy firms in objective terms and factor in the same in the procurement of DPR assignments, it has now been decided that the Rating of the DPR firms shall be done by NHAI twice in a year. Rating of Normal Highway Projects, Standalone Bridges/ROB Projects and Standalone Tunnels Projects shall be done separately. The assessed rating shall be one of the criteria for evaluation and selection of the H-1 bidder in the upcoming RFP for appointment of DPR Consultants on National Highway Projects.

2. In order to assess the rating of the consultants, the performance of the consultant in each project shall be assessed which shall further be normalized based on Project Cost, extent of LA and length of structure (in case of standalone projects). The detailed evaluation criteria and marking scheme for each Normal Highway Project, Standalone Bridge/ROB Projects and Standalone Tunnel Projects are attached as **Annexure-I, Annexure-II and Annexure-III** respectively. The eligible projects meeting the following criteria shall be selected for rating:

(i) Projects where 180 days have elapsed after Appointed Date (AD).
(ii) Projects wherein Provisional Completion/Completion has been issued.
(iii) 4/6 laning projects longer than 10 km and 2 laning project longer than 25 km to be considered for rating.
(iv) Above identified projects in last 3 Financial Years shall be considered for preparation of rating i.e. for instance FY 2024-25, 2023-24 and 2022-23 be assessed in FY 2025-26.

3. The methodology for normalization of rating of Normal Highway Projects is as under:

(a) Project Cost Based Normalisation of Score:

Total Capital Cost (Excluding GST) as approved by sanctioning authority	Weightage Factor
Upto 100 Cr	0.75
More than 100 Cr but upto 500 Cr	1.00
More than 500 Cr but upto 1000 Cr	1.25
More than 1000 Cr	1.50

(b)Extent of Land Acquisition Based Normalisation of Score (to be kept for only Greenfield project 50% project length):

Greenfield Length of the Project as percentage of Total Project Length	Weightage Factor
More than 50% but upto 75%	1.25
More than 75%	1.50

(c) Net Weightage Factor for Greenfield Project= 0.7x Project Cost weightage factor + 0.3x Extent of LA weightage Factor

(d) Net Weightage Factor for Brownfield Project = Project Cost weightage factor

(e) Final Overall Assessment Formula for DPR Consultant for Normal Highway Project:

Rating Score= Σ (Individual Project Score x Net Weightage Factor) / Σ Net Weightage Factor

4. The methodology for normalization of rating of Standalone Tunnel and Bridge/ROB Projects is as under:

(a) Project Cost Based Normalisation of Score:

Total Capital Cost (Excluding GST) as approved by sanctioning authority	Weightage Factor
upto 500 Cr	1.00
More than 500 Cr but upto 1000 Cr	1.25
More than 1000 Cr but upto 1500 Cr	1.50
More than 1500 Cr	2.00

(b) Structure Length Based Normalisation of Score:

Structre Length (excluding approaches) in Meters	Weightage Factor
upto 500 meters	1.00
More than 500 meters but upto 1000 meters	1.10
More than 1000 but upto 1500 meters	1.25
More than 1500 meters	1.50

(c) Net Weightage Factor= 0.7 x Project Cost weightage factor + 0.3 x Structure Length based weightage Factor

(d) Final Overall Assessment Formula for DPR Consultant for Standalone Tunnel/Bridge Project:

Rating Score= Σ (Individual Project Score x Net Weightage Factor) / Σ Net Weightage Factor

5. The following methodology shall have to be followed for rating exercise:

(i) Rating exercise shall be done twice in a year, in first iteration taking eligible projects upto 15th February and preferably rate the same by 30th March and in second iteration taking eligible projects upto 15th August, and preferably rate the same by 30th September.

(ii) Scoring of all eligible projects as per criteria and marking scheme detailed in Annexure-I, Annexure-II and Annexure-III (as the case may be) after application of normalization factors should be used to evaluate the overall assessment rating of the consulting firm.

(iii) Rating of Normal Highway Projects, Standalone Bridges and Standalone Tunnels to be done separately.

(iv) For Projects to be assessed after 180 days of AD, the parameters for which data is not available shall not be scored and the score of remaining parameters shall be extrapolated on pro-rata basis.

(v) Assessed Rating should be shared with concerned Consultants for submitting their representations/challenges, if any, and thereafter the Rating be finalised and released on public domain.

(vi) All JV Partners and Associates shall be given the same rating score as applicable to the individual project.

(vii) As far as possible Majority data/reference should be sourced from Data Lake/PMIS (i.e. digital record repository)

5. NHAI shall be the nodal agency for the compilation of assessment of rating of DPR Consultants. All implementing agencies of MoRT&H (NHAI/NHIDCL/BRO/State PWDs) are requested to assess the project wise rating of the DPR consultants as per methodology detailed above and submit to NHAI through MoRT&H. Independent Agencies may also be deployed for assisting the departments in assessment of the rating.

6. This issues with the approval of Hon'ble Minister (RT&H).

Yours faithfully,

Enclosure: As above

(Akil Ahmad)

Superintending Engineering (S&R)

Annexure-I

Assessment Criteria and marking scheme for Normal Highway projects:

S No.	Parameter	Source of Information	Criteria	Total Marking Weightage	Marking Scheme	
1.	**Realistic Project Cost Estimation** **(Rationale: detailed investigations, surveys and meticulous planning is required for realistic cost estimation)**	Datalake	Difference in estimated project cost vs avg quote received from upto 5 bidders from L-1 to max L-5 bidder	3	% financial quote above or below estimate	Marks
					Upto 10%	3
					10-20%	2
					20-30%	1
					more than 30%	0
2.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to incomplete LA** **(Rationale: Expeditious LA is one of the key-factors in timely declaration of AD thereby limiting any delay related claims on Authority and provides for unhindered work front for timely completion of project)**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of completion of land acquisition (80%/90% as the case may be). The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Accuracy (type of land/ quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures • Timely submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	10	Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures	
					• Error in quantification of area <5% - 2 >5<10%-1 10% - 0	2
					• Error in total no of structures <5% - 2 >5<10%-1 10% - 0	2
					• Delay in Submission of **3A of at least 90% land after approval of alignment** <30 days - 3.0 30-60 days - 1.5 >60 days - 0 (average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)	3

1/20

					• Delay in Submission of **3D of at least 90% land after 3C** <30 days - 3.0 30-60 days - 1.5 >60 days - 0 (average delay in submission of all 3D notifications to be calculated)	3
3.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-receipt of forest/wildlife/ ESZ clearance** **(Rationale: Timely receipt of clearances aids in timely declaration of AD thereby limiting any delay related claims on Authority and provides for unhindered work front for timely completion of project)**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of achieving Stage-I Forest Clearance. The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Timely submission on Parivesh Portal • Timely Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal • Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR	5 1.5 1.5 2	• Submission on Parivesh Portal from alignment approval Delay in days <30 days - 1.5 >30<45 days - 1.0 >45 days - 0.0	1.5
					• Timely Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal Delay in days <7 days - 1.5 >7-14 days - 1.0 >14 days - 0.0	1.5
					• Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR Identified completely - 2 Not identified - 0 (In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 1 hectare,	2.0

2/20

					then complete 5 marks will become 0)	
4.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-approval of GAD from Railway /Irrigation /Other Applicable department** **(Rationale: Timely receipt of approvals from other departments aids in timely declaration of AD thereby limiting any delay related claims on Authority and provides for unhindered work front for timely completion of project)**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of approval of GAD by the concerned Department. The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Timely uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) • Timely compliance of observations of the concerned department	7.5	Case 1: For DPR projects awarded before 14.06.2024 Difference in days of Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of approval of GAD by the concerned Department Case 2: For DPR projects awarded after 14.06.2024 • Delay in uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) from date of Joint Survey of DPR Consultant with the GAD Approving Agency (i.e. Railway/Irrigation Deptt. etc.) Delay in days <30 days - 3.5 >30<45 days - 2.0 >45 days - 0.0	Marks 3.5
					• Delay in compliance of observations of the concerned department Delay in days <7 days - 4 >7-14 days - 2 >14 days - 0	4

3/20

5.	**COS/variation order in Project due to technical deficiencies** **(Rationale: Proper investigations, planning and design during DPR stage itself limits any COS which is an additional burden on the Exchequer and also leads to time and cost overrun)**	Datalake/Division Record	COS/variation order in Project such as errors due to inadequate traffic survey (MSA calculation, VDF Calculation, diverted traffic analysis), incorrect geotechnical investigations, calculation errors in design of pavement layers, incorrect geometric design considerations, calculation errors in cost estimates, incomplete scope of work in schedule-B/C, incorrect HFL estimation, incorrect geological investigations including Non-identification of critical locations for ground/soil improvement	16	COS due to said reasons as % of total project cost as estimated by the DPR consultant	Marks
					Less than 2%	16
					2-5%	12
					5-10%	9
					10-20%	4
					More Than 20%	0
					In case of BOT projects, if target traffic projected after 5 years of COD and actual traffic achieved, have a variation of more than 20%, then 5 negative marks will be assigned. Note: Consultant shall not be penalised for any technical submission which was made by him but rejected by Authority and ultimately lead to a Change of scope during execution, if the same has been documented & recorded.	
6.	**COS/variation order in Project due to incorrect utility shifting estimation** (Rationale: Correct estimation of utility shifting in DPR stage facilitates any additional COS related cost and time overruns during execution)	Datalake/Division Record	COS/Variation order in Project due to failure of DPR consultant to identify the quantum of Utilities (underground or overhead) along the project.	12	COS on account of utility shifting as % of total estimated project cost by the DPR consultant	Marks
					Upto 0.5%	5
					0.5-1%	3
					2-3%	1.5
					More than 3%	0
					No. of Overhead Poles/Towers/Transformers/sub-stations/crossings etc. (electricity/ telecom) missed by DPR consultant as % of total Overhead Poles/Towers estimated in Technical Schedules.	Marks

4/20

					In case more than 2 EHT crossing are missed then 0 marks will be assigned in this criterion	
					Upto 2%	3
					2-5%	2
					More than 5% but less than 15%	1.5
					More than 15% but less than 25%	1
					More than 25%	0
					Length of electricity line or pipelines (water/ waste/ gas/ petroleum/OFC) missed by the DPR consultant as % of total length of electricity line or pipelines estimated in Technical Schedules. In case erroneous classification of voltage of lines is done then 0 marks will be assigned in this criterion	Marks
					Upto 2%	3
					2-5%	2
					More than 5% but less than 15%	1.5
					More than 15% but less than 25%	1
					More than 25%	0
7.	**Discrepancy in Land Acquisition** **(Rationale: discrepancy in LA can lead to additional cost as well as time implications for the Authority besides delay related claims from contractors)**	Bhoomirashi/ Division Record	In case additional land (than actually required) has been acquired due to error of the DPR consultant leading for additional expenditure on exchequer Incorrect identification of land type as well as no. of structures (Leading to increase in cost of LA)	2.5	Upto 1% of total land to be acquired in project	2.5
					1-3%	1.75
					3-5%	1
					More than 5%	0
	Extent of Missing Plots	Bhoomirashi/ Division Record	Extent of missing plots in sqm to be identified	10	w.r.t total acquired area Before Appointed Date	5

5/20

	(Rationale: Missing plots hinder continuous work front to the contractor leading to cost and time related delays)				Nil- 5 <0.1% - 4 >0.1%<0.3% - 3 >0.3%<0.6% - 1.5 >0.6% - 0	
					After Appointed date Nil-5 <0.05% - 4 >0.05%<0.1% - 3 >0.1%<0.2% - 1.5 >0.2% - 0	5
8.	Discrepancy in Geotechnical/ Sub-Surface investigation (Rationale: Geotechnical investigations become the basis for design of pavement and structures and any discrepancy in the same can lead to major design changes thereby affecting cost and time overruns)	Datalake/RO-PD Record	Difference in in-situ (not effective) CBR values (for pavement) and bearing capacity of soil (for structures) and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ concessionaire. In case of tunnels variation from geological baselines would be considered	14	Difference in CBR values (for pavement) estimated by DPR consultant and that estimated by Contractor/ concessionaire by more than 10%	Marks
					Less than 10% of project length	7
					10-25% length of project	3.5
					More than 25% length of project	0
					Difference in values of bearing capacity of soil (for major structures i.e. length >60m) estimated by DPR consultant and that estimated by Contractor/ concessionaire by more than 10%	Marks
					Less than 3 major structures	7
					3-5 major structures	3.5
					5 or more major structures	0
9.	Other important design criteria (Rationale: Details in design affect the cost estimation by bidders	RO/ PD Record	Inadequate design recommendations of structures by DPR consultants due to any reason such as incorrect bearing capacity estimation, incorrect silt factor estimation, incorrect	10	No. of such individual errors/inaccuracies	Marks
					Nil	10
					1	7

6/20

	as well as assist Authority in approving design consideration during execution. Therefore, incorrect design consideration lead to ambiguity in project scope and may lead to disputes besides time and cost overruns)		Minimum waterway estimation, incorrect scour depth estimation, minimum well diameter, inadequate river training structures, change in location of structures, incorrect geological or geotechnical profiling, non-recommendation of minimum required steel and cement grade in critical structures, not recommending ground improvement measures, slope protection works, non-identification of sliding zone-sinking zone-marshy area-black cotton soil area. Additionally incorrect geometric design, faulty entry/exit arrangement at junctions/ intersections/ median openings etc.		2-3	5
					4-5	2
					6 or more	0
10.	**Delay in submission of deliverables** **(Rationale: Delay in submission of deliverables leads to delay in project**	Datalake RO/ PD Record	Delay in submission of Final Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	5	No. of days of Delay in submission of Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	marks
					upto 10 days	5
					11-20 days	3
					20-30 days	1.5
					More than 30 days	0

7/20

	appraisals and approvals which can also increase project cost due to inflation and also hinders achievement of award targets set by MoRTH)				Note: 1. In case of delay in submission of both final feasibility report and final DPR report the delay of each report to be added and marks be allotted based on cumulative delay. 2. In case of any EOT granted by implementing agency, the delay period shall be calculated wrt to such EOT.
			Total Marks	100	

8/20

Annexure-II

Assessment Parameters for Standalone Structures/ Bridge/ ROB projects:

S No.	Parameter	Source of Information	Criteria	Total Marking Weightage	Marking Scheme	
1.	Realistic Project Cost Estimation	Datalake	Difference in estimated project cost vs avg quote received from upto 5 bidders from L-1 to max L-5 bidder	5	% financial quote above or below estimate	Marks
					Upto 20%	5
					20-30%	3.5
					30-40%	1.5
					more than 40%	0
2.	Delay in LA of bridge approaches	Datalake/Division Record	Delay in completion of Land Acquisition for approach roads of bridges/ ROBs/ Viaducts before declaration of Appointed Date for any of the following reasons • Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures • Timely submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	10	Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures • Error in quantification of area <2.5% - 3 >2.5<5% - 1.5 10% - 0 • Error in total no of structures <2.5% - 2 >2.5 - 0	5
					• Delay in Submission of **3A of at least 90% land after approval of alignment** <30 days - 2.5 30-60 days - 1.5 >60 days - 0 (average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)	5

9/20

					• Delay in Submission of **3D of at least 90% land after 3C** <30 days - 2.5 30-60 days - 1.5 >60 days - 0 (average delay in submission of all 3D notifications to be calculated)	
3.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-receipt of forest/wildlife/ ESZ clearance**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of achieving Stage-I Forest Clearance. The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Timely submission on Parivesh Portal • Timely Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal • Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR	5	Delay in submission on Parivesh Portal from date of alignment approval Delay in days <30 days - 1.5 >30<45 days - 1.0 >45 days - 0.0	1.5
					Delay in Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal Delay in days <7 days - 1.5 >7-14 days - 1.0 >14 days - 0.0	1.5
					Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR • Identified completely - 2 • Not identified - 0 (In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 0.25 hectare, then complete 5 marks will become 0)	2

10/20

4.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-approval of GAD from Railway /Irrigation /Other Applicable department**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of approval of GAD by the concerned Department. The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Timely uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission)	7.5	• Delay in uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) from date of Joint Survey of DPR Consultant with the GAD Approving Agency (i.e. Railway/Irrigation Deptt. etc.) Delay in days <30 days - 3.5 >30<45 days - 2.0 >45 days - 0.0	3.5
			• Timely compliance of observations of the concerned department		• Delay in compliance of observations of the concerned department Delay in days <7 days - 4 >7-14 days - 2 >14 days - 0	4
5.	**COS/variation order in Project due to technical deficiencies**	Datalake/Division Record	COS/variation order in Project such as errors due to inadequate traffic survey (MSA calculation, VDF Calculation, diverted traffic analysis), incorrect geotechnical investigations, calculation errors in design of pavement layers,	30	COS due to said reasons as % of total project cost as estimated by the DPR consultant	Marks
					Less than 2%	30
					2-5%	20
					5-10%	15
					10-20%	7.5

11/20

			incorrect geometric design considerations, calculation errors in cost estimates, incomplete scope of work in schedule-B/C, incorrect HFL estimation, incorrect geological investigations including Non-identification of critical locations for ground/soil improvement, Inadequate design recommendations of structures by DPR consultants due to any reason such as incorrect bearing capacity estimation, incorrect silt factor estimation, incorrect Minimum waterway estimation, incorrect scour depth estimation, minimum well diameter, inadequate river training structures, change in location of structures, incorrect geological or geotechnical profiling, non-recommendation of minimum required steel and cement grade in critical structures.		More Than 20%	0
					Note: Consultant shall not be penalised for any technical submission which was made by him but rejected by Authority and ultimately lead to a Change of scope during execution, if the same has been documented & recorded.	

6.	**Extent of Missing Plots**	Bhoomirashi/ Division Record	Extent of missing plots in sqm to be identified (Ponds/Temples/Religious Places)	5	Extent of missing plots in sqm to be identified (Ponds/Temples/Religious Places)	Marks
					w.r.t total acquired area Nil- 5 Upto 0.05% - 4 >0.05%<0.1% - 3 >0.1%<0.2% - 1.5 >0.2% - 0	5
7.	**Discrepancy in Geotechnical Testing/Sub-Surface investigation/ Hydrology Models**	Datalake/RO-PD Record	Difference in bearing capacity of soil and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire. Difference in silt factor estimation estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire. Difference in HFL levels estimated by estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire. Difference in waterway estimation between DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire. For ROB/Viaducts all 30 marks are to be allocated for bearing capacity of soil and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.	30	Difference in values of bearing capacity of soil estimated by DPR consultant and that estimated by Contractor/ Concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority) for any foundation of the bridge	Marks
					Upto 5%	7.5
					5-10%	5
					10-20%	2.5
					More than 20%	0
					Difference in silt factor estimation estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority).	Marks
					Upto 5%	7.5
					5-10%	5
					10-20%	2.5
					More than 20%	0

13/20

					Difference in HFL levels estimated by estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority).	Marks
					Upto 0.5 meters	7.5
					0.5-1 meters	5
					1-2 metres	2.5
					More than 2 meters	0
					Difference in waterway estimation between DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.	Marks
					Upto 0.5 meters	7.5
					0.5-1 meters	5
					1-2 metres	2.5
					More than 2 meters	0
8.	**Delay in submission of deliverables**	RO/ PD Record	Delay in submission of Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	5	No. of days of Delay in submission of Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	Marks
					upto 10 days	5
					11-20 days	3
					20-30 days	1.5
					More than 30 days	0
					Note: 1. In case of delay in submission of both final feasibility report and final DPR report the delay of each report to be added and marks be allotted based on cumulative delay. 2. In case of any EOT granted by implementing agency, the delay period shall be calculated wrt to such EOT.	
			Total Marks	**100**		

14/2

Annexure-III

Assessment Criteria and marking scheme Standalone Tunnel Projects:

S No.	Parameter	Source of Information	Criteria	Total Marking Weightage	Marking Scheme	
1.	**Realistic Project Cost Estimation**	Datalake	Difference in estimated project cost vs avg quote received from upto 5 bidders from L-1 to max L-5 bidder	10	% financial quote above or below estimate	Marks
					Upto 20%	10
					20-30%	7
					30-40%	3
					more than 40%	0
2.	**Delay in LA** of tunnel approaches	Datalake/Division Record	Delay in completion of Land Acquisition for approach roads of tunnels before declaration of Appointed Date for any of the following reasons • Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures • Timely submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	5	• Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures	Marks
					• Error in quantification of area <2.5% - 1.5 >2.5<5%-0.5 10% - 0 • Error in total no of structures <2.5% - 1.5 >2.5 - 0	3
					• Delay in submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	Marks
					• Delay in Submission of **3A of at least 90% land after approval of alignment** <30 days - 1 30-60 days - 0.5 >60 days - 0	1

15/20

					(average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)	
					• Delay in Submission of **3D of at least 90% land after 3C** <30 days - 1 30-60 days - 0.5 >60 days - 0 (average delay in submission of all 3D notifications to be calculated)	1
3.	**Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-receipt of forest/wildlife/ ESZ clearance**	Datalake/Division Record	Difference in Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of achieving Stage-I Forest Clearance. The role of the DPR consultant to be evaluated based on the following parameters: • Timely submission on Parivesh Portal • Timely Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal • Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR	10	Delay in submission on Parivesh Portal from alignment approval Delay in days <30 days - 3 >30<45 days - 1.5 >45 days - 0.0	3
					Delay in Compliance to EDS Observations on Parivesh Portal Delay in days <7 days - 3 >7-14 days - 1.5 >14 days - 0.0	3
					Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR • Identified completely - 4 • Not identified - 0 (In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 0.25	4

16/20

					hectare, then complete 10 marks will become 0)	
4.	**COS/variation order in Project due to technical deficiencies**	Datalake/Division Record	COS/variation order in Project such as errors due to incorrect geotechnical investigations, incorrect geometric design considerations, calculation errors in cost estimates, incomplete scope of work in schedule-B/C, incorrect geological investigations including Non-identification of critical locations for ground/soil improvement, Inadequate design recommendations due to any reason such as incorrect bearing capacity estimation, incorrect geological or geotechnical profiling, incorrect RMR-Q value estimation, incorrect portal citing, not recommending ground improvement measures, slope protection works, non-identification of sliding zone-sinking zone-marshy area-black cotton soil area, non-recommendation of minimum required steel and cement grade in critical structures.	20	COS due to said reasons as % of total project cost as estimated by the DPR consultant	Marks
					Less than 2%	20
					2-5%	15
					5-10%	10
					10-20%	5
					More Than 20%	0
					Note: Consultant shall not be penalised for any technical submission which was made by him but rejected by Authority and ultimately lead to a Change of scope during execution, if the same has been documented & recorded.	

17/20

5.	**Extent of Missing Plots**	Bhoomirashi/ Division Record	Extent of missing plots in sqm to be identified (Ponds/Temples/Religious Places)	5	Extent of missing plots identified Before/After Appointed Date w.r.t total acquired area	Marks
					Nil	5
					<0.05%	4
					>0.05%<0.1%	3
					>0.1%<0.2%	1.5
					>0.2%	0
6.	**Discrepancy in Geotechnical Testing/ Sub-Surface investigation**	Datalake/RO-PD Record	Variation from geological baselines and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/concessionaire. Incorrect rock classification through RMR value and Q-Value. Incorrect Portal location due to non-feasibility upto 5 meters	32.5	Difference in geological baselines and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority)	Marks
					Less than 5% of project length	7.5
					5-10% length of project	6
					10-20% length of project	4
					20-30% length of project	2
					More than 30% length of project	0
					Change in Rock Quality Classification (through RMR value and through Tunnelling Quality Index i.e. Q Value) Rock type estimated by DPR consultant and that estimated by Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority)	10
					Less than 5% of project length	10
					5-10% length of project	8
					10-20% length of project	6
					20-30% length of project	3
					More than 30% length of project	0
					Change in Sub surface drainage pattern estimated by DPR consultant and that estimated by	7.5

18/20

					Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority)	
					Less than 5% of project length	7.5
					5-10% length of project	6
					10-20% length of project	4
					20-30% length of project	2
					More than 30% length of project	0
					Incorrect Portal location estimation by due to geotechnical/geological non-feasibility	Marks
					Less than 1 metre	7.5
					1-2 meters	5
					2-5 meters	2
					More than 5 meters	0
7.	**Other important design criteria**	RO/ PD Record	Recommendation of construction method, lighting strategy, ventilation strategy, emergency exits, and fire suppression systems.	7.5	Any incident/accident reported during/after construction of the tunnel due to the aforementioned reasons	Marks
					No incident	7.5
					Major Injury or Minor damage to structure	3
					Fatality or Major damage to structure	1.5
					Fatality with Major Damage to Structure	0
8.	**Identification of Muck Disposal area**	RO/PD Record	Muck Disposal area assessment and identification	5	Identification of muck disposal area	Marks
					Non-identification	0
					Inadequate Identification	1.5
					Adequate Identification	3
					processing of requisite approvals/ permissions for use of the muck disposal area from the concerned State Authorities	Marks

13/20

					approvals/ permissions not processed	0
					approvals/ permissions processed	2
9.	**Delay in submission of deliverables**	RO/ PD Record	Delay in submission of Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	5	No. of days of Delay in submission of Feasibility Study and/or Final DPR Report	marks
					upto 10 days	5
					11-20 days	3
					20-30 days	1.5
					More than 30 days	0
					Note: 1. In case of delay in submission of both final feasibility report and final DPR report the delay of each report to be added and marks be allotted based on cumulative delay. 2. In case of any EOT granted by implementing agency, the delay period shall be calculated wrt to such EOT.	
			Total Marks	**100**		

20/20