



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: 07th July, 2025

Office Memorandum

Sub: Invitation for Public Comments on Proposed Rating criteria for Consultancy firms engaged in preparation of DPR and functioning as AE/IE.

The Ministry/NHAI is in the process of developing a rating system/criterion for consultancy firms engaged in the preparation of Detailed Project Reports (DPR) and functioning as Authority Engineer (AE)/Independent Engineer (IE). Concept notes outlining the proposed criteria are enclosed herewith for reference.

Comments/suggestions on the proposed concept note, if any, may kindly be submitted within twenty-one (21) days from the date of this communication i.e. upto 28.07.2025, to the email address srdivisionmorth@gmail.com.

Encl: As above,

(Akil Ahmad)
Superintending Engineer (S&R)
For Director General (RD) & SS

To

NIC- for uploading on Ministry website under 'whats new'/ any other appropriate place, for obtaining Public comments

Copy for kind information to:

1. Sr. PPS to Secretary (RT&H)
2. Sr PPS to DG(RD)&SS
3. Sr. PPS/PPS to AS (RT&H)/ AS&FA
4. PS to all ADGs / JSs

Concept Note on DPR Rating Criteria

Need:

1. Assessment of actual performance of DPR firms in objective terms.
2. Identification of performers and non-performers
3. Prepare Policy to Incentivise/ Disincentivise DPR firms

Eligibility for assessment:

1. Projects where 180 days have elapsed after Appointed date
2. Projects wherein Provisional Completion/Completion has been issued.
3. 4/6 laning projects longer than 10 km and 2 laning project longer than 25 km to be considered for rating.

Methodology:

1. All projects matching the eligibility defined above shall be scored objectively.
2. Rating of Normal Highway Projects, Standalone Bridges and Standalone Tunnels to be done separately.
3. Scoring of all normal highway projects shall be normalised using criteria of project cost (and Extent of Land Acquisition for Greenfield Projects i.e. more than 50% project length is greenfield).
4. Scoring of Bridge and Tunnel projects would be normalised based on project cost and length of structure.
5. 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.
6. Preferably Rating assessment may be done on yearly basis by an Independent Agency
7. All JV Partners and Associates shall be given the same rating score as applicable to the individual project.
8. Rating exercise shall be done twice in an 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.
9. 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.

Assessment Parameters 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	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error in quantification of area <5% - 2 >5<10%-1 10% - 0 	2
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error in total no of structures <5% - 2 >5<10%-1 10% - 0 	2
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	3

	timely completion of project)				(average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in Submission of 3D of at least 90% land after 3C <30 days - 3.0 30-60 days – 1.5 >60 days – 0	3
					(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 (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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
				1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
				1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non identification of forest area/wildlife/Eco Sensitive/Buffer Zone in DPR Identified completely – 2 Not identified – 0	2.0

				2	(In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 1 hectare, then complete 5 marks will become 0)	
4.	<p>Delay in declaration of Appointed Date due to non-approval of GAD from Railway /Irrigation /Other Applicable department</p> <p>(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)</p>	Datalake/Division Record	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) • Timely compliance of observations of the concerned department 	7.5	<p>Case 1: For DPR projects awarded before 14.06.2024</p> <p>Difference in days of Deadline for declaration of Appointed date as per CA and actual date of approval of GAD by the concerned Department</p> <p>Case 2: For DPR projects awarded after 14.06.2024</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) from date of alignment approval <p>Delay in days <30 days – 3.5 >30<45 days – 2.0 >45 days – 0.0</p>	<p>Marks</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>4</p>

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
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
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
					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.	Marks
					In case erroneous classification of voltage of lines is done 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
7.	Discrepancy in Land Acquisition (Rationale: discrepancy in LA can lead to additional cost as well as time implications for the Authority besides delay)	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

	related claims from contractors)					
	Extent of Missing Plots (Rationale: Missing plots hinder continuous work front to the contractor leading to cost and time related delays)	Bhoomirashi/ Division Record	Extent of missing plots in sqm to be identified	10	w.r.t total acquired area Before Appointed Date Nil- 5 <0.1% - 4 >0.1%<0.3% – 3 >0.3%<0.6% – 1.5 >0.6% - 0	5
					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	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% Less than 10% of project length 10-25% length of project More than 25% length of project 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% Less than 3 major structures 3-5 major structures 5 or more major structures	Marks 7 3.5 0 Marks 7 3.5 0

	and time overruns)					
9.	Other important design criteria (Rationale: Details in design affect the cost estimation by bidders 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)	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 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.	10	No. of such individual errors/inaccuracies	Marks
					Nil	10
					1	7
					2-3	5
					4-5	2
10.	Delay in submission of deliverables (Rationale: Delay in submission of	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

	deliverables leads to delay in project appraisals and approvals which can also increase project cost due to inflation and also hinders achievement of award targets set by MoRTH)				Note: 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.
			Total Marks	100	

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

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

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

Net Weightage Factor for Brownfield Project = Project Cost weightage factor

Final Overall Assessment Formula for DPR Consultant:

Rating Score= $\sum (\text{Individual Project Score} \times \text{Net Weightage Factor}) / \sum \text{Net Weightage Factor}$

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	<p>Delay in completion of Land Acquisition for approach roads of bridges/ ROBs/ Viaducts before declaration of Appointed Date for any of the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures • Timely submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal 	10	<p>Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>(average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)</p>	5

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified completely – 2 • Not identified – 0 	2

					(In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 0.25 hectare, 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	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) • Timely compliance of observations of the concerned department 	7.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delay in uploading proposal on GAD portal (first submission) from date of alignment approval Delay in days <30 days – 3.5 >30<45 days – 2.0 >45 days – 0.0 	3.5
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	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

			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, 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	<p>Difference in bearing capacity of soil and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.</p> <p>Difference in silt factor estimation estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.</p> <p>Difference in HFL levels estimated by estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.</p> <p>Difference in waterway estimation between DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.</p> <p>For ROB/Viaducts all 30 marks are to be allocated for bearing capacity of soil</p>	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
					Difference in HFL levels estimated by estimated by	Marks

			and soil profile estimated by DPR consultant and Contractor/ Concessionaire.		DPR consultant and Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority).	
					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 submission deliverables in of	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: 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.	
			Total Marks	100		

Assessment Parameters for Standalone Tunnel Projects:

S No.	Parameter	Source of Information	Criteria	Total Weightage	Marking	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures• Timely submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	5		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accuracy (quantification of area/ No. & total no. of structures	Marks
						<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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
						<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delay in submission of draft LA notifications to Authority on Bhoomirashi Portal	Marks
						<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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

					(average delay in submission of all 3A notifications to be calculated)	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay in Submission of 3D of at least 90% land after 3C <30 days - 1 30-60 days – 0.5 >60 days – 0	1
					(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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified completely – 4 	4

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not identified – 0 (In case of non-identification of forest area of more than 0.25 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	20	COS due to said reasons as % of total project cost as estimated by the DPR consultant Less than 2% 2-5% 5-10% 10-20% More Than 20%	Marks 20 15 10 5 0

			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.		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.	
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	10

					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)	
					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 Contractor/ concessionaire (or by a third party appointed by Authority)	7.5
					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
					approvals/ permissions not processed	0
					approvals/ permissions processed	2
9.	Delay submission in 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: 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.
			Total Marks	100	

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

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

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

Final Overall Assessment Formula for DPR Consultant:

Rating Score= $\sum (\text{Individual Project Score} \times \text{Net Weightage Factor}) / \sum \text{Net Weightage Factor}$

Concept Note on AE/IE Rating Criteria

Need:

1. Assessment of actual performance of Supervision Consultancy firms in objective terms.
2. Identification of performers and non-performers
3. Major Areas for improvement during Supervision
4. Prepare Policy to Incentivise/ Disincentivise firms

Eligibility for assessment:

- (i) Projects wherein one year has elapsed since Appointed Date
- (ii) Projects with atleast 50% project progress
- (iii) Projects where completion of original consultancy period (construction only) in last 3 Financial Years i.e. for instance FY 2024-25, 2023-24 and 2022-23 be assessed in FY 2025-26.

Record Reference: Majority data/reference shall be sourced from Data Lake

Methodology:

1. All projects matching the eligibility defined above shall be scored objectively.
2. Scoring of all projects shall be normalised using criteria of project cost and Extent of Land Acquisition and factor for special projects.
3. 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.
4. All JV Partners and Associates shall be given the same rating score as applicable to the individual project.
5. 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.
6. For Projects to be assessed after one year 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.

Assessment Parameters for individual projects:

S No.	Parameter	Source Information	Criteria	Total Marking Weightage	Marking Scheme		
1.	Deployment of Key-Personnel (Rationale: Timely deployment of KPs on site ensures all critical appointed date related issues as well as other major technical issues are handled effectively since start of the project)	Datalake	Difference in date of commencement and actual deployment at site. For Normal Highway Project: deployment of TL/RE cum HE, BE, SPS, SQME to be considered For Standalone Bridge Project: deployment of TL/RE cum PE/BE to be considered For Standalone Tunnel Project: deployment of TL/RE cum ES, Sr. Geotech. Experts, Tunnel Design Engineer, Tunnel Safety Expert to be considered Further, total man-months for which the KP was deployed on the Project w.r.t the contract requirement shall also be assessed	5	Difference in days between date of Commencement and actual deployment		Marks
					15 days		5 2.5 (100%)
					16-30 days		3 1.75 (60%)
					31-45 days		1.5 1 (30%)
					46 days or more		0
					Note: Out of Total Marks: 40% Marks be allocated for deployment of TL and rest 60% marks be equally divided amongst remaining key-personnel as per project type specified in criteria column. For Eg. for Bridge Project TL is deployed in 10 days, RE cum PE in 20 days and BE is deployed in 45 days then marks shall be allocated as under:		
					Position	Max Marks	Actual Marks as per time of deployment
					TL	1 (40%)	1 (100%)
					REcumPE	0.75 (30%)	0.45 (60%)
					BE	0.75 (30%)	0.225 (30%)
	Total	1.675					
Total Man-months for which the KPs have been deployed on the project as a		Marks					

			Note: If any KP position remains vacant for more than 30 days then entire marks corresponding to that Key Position shall be reduced to zero (0). Position to be considered vacant if date of submission of replacement CV after creation of vacancy exceeds 30 days.		percentage of total man-month requirement of the project	
					90-100%	2.5
					75-90%	1.75
					60-75%	1
					<60%	0
					Note: Out of Total Marks: 40% Marks be allocated for deployment of TL and rest 60% marks be equally divided amongst remaining key-personnel as per project type specified in criteria column.	
2.	Replacement of Key-Personnel (Rationale: Frequent replacement hampers the institutional memory of the project and wastes critical time in replacement of the KPs)	Datalake	No. of cases where replacement within construction period exceeds 5%, 15%, 30%, 50% strength of KPs	5	Percentage Replacement in construction Period	Marks
					Less than 5% 10%	5
					5-15% 10-30%	3
					15-30% 30-60%	1.5
					50% or above 60% or above	0
					Note: In case of even a single replacement of Team leader, a negative marking of 2.5 shall be applied to the consultant.	
3	Review of design/drawing (Rationale: Prompt Action on Part of Consultant expedites project progress and reduces chances	Datalake	Difference in date of submission to AE/IE and actual approval by AE/IE (Total duration for which the proposal was with AE/IE to be counted including instances of return of	7.5	Difference in date of submission to AE/IE and actual approval by AE/IE	Marks
					15 days	7.5
					16-30 days	5
					31-45 days	3
					46 days or more	0

	of project time and cost overrun)		proposal back to contractor)		Note: Delay analysis to be done for all drawing submission by the contractor/concessionaire and the average value to be taken for final scoring.	
4.	Intervention on critical issues (Rationale: Role of consultant in correct judgement and timely action in critical issues is important from perspective of protecting Project interest and bogus claims of contractors)	Datalake/ PD Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to project completion timelines Quality Control interventions Dispute Resolution Efficacy (DRB/AT Award in favour of Authority) 	10 7	To be judged by PD based on record available in MPRs	
					Period	Marks
					Adherence to Project Completion Timelines As per SPCD: 100% marks (2 Bonus Marks for completion of project before SPCD)	3.5
					Within 6 months from SPCD: 80% Marks	
					Within 12 months from SPCD: 50% marks	
					Within 12-24 months from SPCD: 25% marks	
					After 24 months from SPCD: 0% marks	
					Note: 1. SPCD to be taken as per CA 2. Provisional completion not to be considered as completion	
					Construction Quality Control Measures:	3
					No. of failed tests (quality or quantity) during quality/vigilance/CTE inspections through Authority	
					Nil	
					1-2	

					3-5	50%	3.5
					5-10	25%	
					More than 10	0%	
					Dispute Resolution Efficacy (DRB/AT Award in favour of Authority)		
					All awards in favour of Authority	3.5	
					Net Award in favour of Authority	2	
					Net Award against to Authority	0	
Note: 1. Award can be in monetary terms or in terms of extension of Tolling Period. 2. Net Award= Award in Favour of Authority – Award in Favour of Contractor/Concessionaire							
5.	Timely Resolution of COS (Rationale: Prompt Action on Part of Consultant expedites project progress)	Datalake	Total No. of Days wherein the COS proposal was with AE/IE before recommending to Authority (except utility COS) (Total duration for which the proposal was with AE/IE to be counted including instances of return of proposal back to contractor)	15	Difference in date of submission to AE/IE and actual approval by AE/IE	Marks	
					15 days	15	
					16-30 days	10	
					31-45 days	5	
					46 days or more	0	
Note: Delay analysis to be done for all COS proposals submitted by the contractor/concessionaire and the average value to be taken for final scoring.							
6.	Timely Resolution of EOT	Datalake	Total No. of Days wherein the EOT proposal was with AE/IE before	15	Difference in date of submission to AE/IE and actual approval by AE/IE	Marks	
					15 days	15	
					16-30 days	10	

	(Rationale: Prompt Action on Part of Consultant expedites project progress and reduces chances of disputes at later stages)		recommending to Authority (Total duration for which the proposal was with AE/IE to be counted including instances of return of proposal back to contractor)		31-45 days 46 days or more Note: Delay analysis to be done for all EOT proposals submitted by the contractor/concessionaire and the average value to be taken for final scoring.	5 0
7.	Contract Administration (Rationale: Processing of important correspondences and payments is important to protect the interest of Authority from any)	Datalake/ PD Assessment	Timely processing of PCOD/COD/CC proposals Issuance of letters/ correspondences as per provisions of CA Initiating proposal of delinking/de-scoping as per CA Processing of final payment for IPC/milestone payment	5 15	To be judged by PD based on record available in MPRs/Datalake/Office Avg. time in processing of proposals Upto 7 days 7-15 days 16-30 days More than 30 days Avg. time in processing of bills Upto 7 days 7-15 days 16-30 days More than 30 days	Marks 5 3 1.5 0 Marks 15 10 5 0
8.	PCI Rating of the Project at time of Provisional Completion/ Completion Certificate (Rationale: PCI rating is an indicator of the	NSV Survey Report	PCI calculation to be done as per IRC 82: 2023	40- 11	At the time of PCC/COD/Completion PCI Value 100-90 80-90 60-80 60-40 Less than 40 Two Years post issuance of COD/Completion PCI Value 100-90	Marks 8 6 4.5 3 0 Marks 3

	quality control exercised by the Consultant in the project)				80-90	2
					60-80	1
					60-40	0.5
					Less than 40	0
9.	Accident Blackspots and Safety During Construction (Rationale: Accident & Blackspots indicate lack of intervention during geometric design and planning of project features)	e-DAR / Accident & Fatalities data / Accident Black spots Data analysed after accidents by concerned authority upto 3 years after construction PD Assessment	No. of accidents and black spots occurred/created on the project reach within 3 years of completion of construction of project i.e. COD/ Completion date. Adherence to Safety During Construction by contractor/ concessionaire.	5	Total No. of accidents till 3 years of construction	Marks
					Nil	5 2
					1-5	3.5 1.5
					6-10	2 1
					11 or more	0
					Total No. of blackspots notified till 3 years of construction	Marks
					Nil	2
					1-2	1
					3 or more	0
					Adherence to Safety During Construction by contractor/ concessionaire	Marks
					Complete Adherence on site	1
					Limited Adherence on site	0.5
					No Adherence on site	0
10.	NCR issued (Rationale: Indicate proper supervision and quality control of manuals, codes, specifications & contractual provisions)	Datalake	No. of NCR issued	2.5	Percentage of NCR Close/Raised	Marks
					80-100%	2.5
					60-80%	2
					40-60%	1
					Less than 40%	0
11.	Overall assessment by other stakeholders	Feedback of concerned contractor/ concessionaire	Efficiency of the AE/IE in resolution of project bottlenecks	7.5 10	Feedback of Implementing agency (NHAI/MoRTH/ PWD/ NHIDCL)	3.75 5 Marks
					Effectiveness of Deployed Manpower	0.75 1
					Knowledge about site conditions	0.75 1

	(Rationale: Being the contract administrator (client), Authority's experience while working with the consultants for intangible parameters is also required for assessment of overall performance)	and Director	Project	Time bound processing of proposals of the contractor/ concessionaire		Knowledge about technical schedules/project features/ project progress	0.75 1
						Efforts to assess and improve project Quality	0.75 1
						Efforts towards closing project bottlenecks	0.75 1
				Ensuring Quality in Construction		Note: All above parameters to be judged on a scale as under-	
						Performance of Consultant	Percentage Marks
						Non-Effective	0%
						Least-Effective	25%
						Slightly-Effective	50%
						Very-Effective	75%
						Extremely Effective	100%
						Feedback of concerned contractor/ concessionaire on performance of consultant	3.75 5 Marks
						Performance of Consultant	Percentage Marks
						Non-Effective	0%
						Least-Effective	25%
						Slightly-Effective	50%
						Very-Effective	75%
						Extremely Effective	100%
12.	Penal Action on Consultant	Datalake/ Division Record	Major Penalty (Debarment Order issued by NHAI/MoRTH/NHIDCL for any construction supervision project, in last 3 financial years as applicable for eligibility for rating	-7.5	Major Penalty		
					No Major Penalty	0	
					1-2 Major Penalty	-1.5	
					2-3 Major Penalty	-2.5	
					4-5 Major Penalty	-3.5	
					>=6 Major Penalty	-5	
					Minor Penalty		
					No Minor Penalty	0	
					1-2 Minor Penalty	-0.5	

			Minor Penalty (Suspension of Key Staff, Financial Penalty issued by NHAI/MoRTH/NHIDCL/ for any construction supervision project, in last 3 financial years as applicable for eligibility for rating)		2-3 Minor Penalty	-1
					4-5 Major Penalty	-1.5
					>=6 Major Penalty	-2.5
			Total Marks	100		

Project Cost Based Normalisation of Score:

Awarded Cost (excluding GST) for EPC project and Awarded BPC for HAM project	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

Extent of Land Acquisition Based Normalisation of Score:

Greenfield Length of the Project as percentage of Total Project Length	Weightage Factor
Upto 5%	0.75 0.50
More than 5% but upto 25%	1.00 0.75
More than 25% but upto 50%	1.10 1.00
More than 50% but upto 75%	1.25
More than 75%	1.50

Special Weightage Factor (SWP*) for Projects with Tunnels more than 1 km/Extra Dozed Bridge/Cable stayed Bridge/ Suspension Bridge)
= 1.25

For Normal projects SWP = 1.00

Net Weightage Factor= (0.9x Project Cost weightage factor + 0.1x Extent of LA weightage Factor) x SWP

Final Overall Assessment Formula for AE/IE:

Rating Score= $\sum (\text{Individual Project Score} \times \text{Net Weightage Factor}) / \sum \text{Net Weightage Factors}$ ~~Total No. of Projects~~