No.2012/CE-I/CT/0/5  

New Delhi, dated 9.4.2012

Addressed to:
As per list attached

**Sub:** Minimum Eligibility Criteria in Works Tenders.

**Ref:**
(i) Board’s letter no.94/CE-I/CT/4, dated 17.10.2002.
(ii) Board’s letter no.94/CE-I/CT/4, dated 04.06.2003.
(iii) Board’s letter no.94/CE-I/CT/4, dated 21.06.2006.
(iv) Board’s letter no.94/CE-I/CT/4, dated 23.11.2006.

While investigating one of the Vigilance cases on Zonal Railways, it has been noticed by Vigilance Branch that the ‘similar nature of work’ was not defined by the PHOD concerned and this had led to confusion in examining eligibility of the tenderers. Similar situation has been observed in many other cases also, which not only cause delay in finalization of tenders, but also lead to disputes/complaints with regard to definition/application of this eligibility criterion. In this connection, CVC has also observed that the issue of definition of similar work has been contentious in the past also, for which more clarity is needed.

Therefore, it is reiterated that “Similar nature of work should be clearly defined by the PHODs on Open line and nominated Chief Engineer/CSTE/CEE on Construction Organization of the Zonal Railways, it should be strictly followed and the same should be indicated in the NIT/Tender document also. In case of any deviation/modification in the list of similar nature of works, prior approval of the competent authority should be obtained”.

Copy to Adviser (Vigilance) & Adviser Finance (X), Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi for their information please.