

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE HELD ON 16-04-2019.AT 1530hrs TO REDRESS THE GRIEVANCES OF THE BIDDERS, AS PER RULE 67 OF PUNJAB PROCUREMENT RULES, 2014 (AMENDED), FOR PROCUREMENT OF ESSENTIAL ITEMS FOR BHU'S (EXAMINATION COUCH & WHEEL CHAIR) FOR FY 2018-19.

A meeting of the Grievance Redressal Committee was held on 16-04-2019 at 1530hrs in committee room of Director General Health Service Punjab, 24-Cooper Road, Lahore to redress the grievances of the bidders, as per Rule 67 of Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014, for procurement of essential items for BHU's (Examination Couch & Wheel Chair) for Financial Year 2018-19. The Director General Health Services, Punjab chaired the meeting.

2. Following members of Grievance Redressal Committee attended the meeting:

1	The Director General Health Services, Government of the Punjab, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department	In-Chair
2	The Program Director, IRMNCH & Nutrition Program, Government of the Punjab, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department	Member
3	The Co-opted Member O/o the Director General Health Services, Government of the Punjab, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department	Member

3. Following members of the Bid/Technical Evaluation Committee presented the case to the grievance redressal committee:

1	The Additional Director (Procurement), IRMNCH & Nutrition Program, Government of the Punjab, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department
2	The Prequalification Specialist-I, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department
3	Logistics Officer IRMNCH & Nutrition Program, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department

4. Background of the case is that IRMNCH & Nutrition Program, Punjab invited bids for procurement of essential items for BHU's (Examination Couch & Wheel Chair), through advertisement in national press on 21.01.2019 & websites of Department, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department and Punjab Procurement Regularity Authority. The process was initiated for the recommended list of essential items required for IRMNCH & Nutrition Program, Punjab. In response there to, 17 applications were received and opened on 06-02-2019.

5. Out of total 17 applicant firms, no firm was responsive in full. The finalized technical evaluation report was uploaded on the official websites of the IRMNCH & Nutrition Program Punjab, Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department Punjab on 16-03-2019. Against the Technical Evaluation Report, Grievances were received from aggrieved bidders up to 25-03-2019 which were placed before the Grievance Redressal Committee for decision.

6. The case wise proceedings of the meeting are as follows

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
1.	M/s Noorani Surgical PVT. Ltd.	Wheel Chair/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 08 & 10. Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law not provided	The firm stated that: We have attached the Undertaking along with our bidding documents, for your reference I am enclosing the same, which I have already attached.	Mr.Faheem Ahmad from M/s Noorani Surgical PVT. Ltd. attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Detail of Audit Balance Sheet of last 2 fiscal years & Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law provided by the firm. The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that the grievance submitted by the firm is hereby accepted and the status of the firm is declared as “Responsive” .
2.	M/s Noorani Surgical PVT. Ltd.	Examination Couch/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 07, 08, 09 & 10. Product having less than 1 year experience, Audit balance sheet of 2017-18 not attached, Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law not provided	The firm stated that: Product having less than 1 year experience. We have supplied examination couches to Government Nawaz Sharif Kidney Hospital Swat, for your reference I am enclosing the award letter. We are in this business from 1949, and we have supplied thousands of examination couches to different private / government hospitals and organizations, our production unit is in Harbanse Pura Lahore, where you can visit personally and can see the live production of Examination couches and other hospital furniture. Audit balance Sheet of 2017-18 not attached. We have already attached our audited balance sheet for the year 2014-15/2015-16/2016-17, we have received audited balance sheet of 2017-18 in March-19, due to our work pendency,	Mr.Faheem Ahmad from M/s Noorani Surgical PVT. Ltd. attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Detail of Audit Balance Sheet of last 2 fiscal years & local environment experience provided by the firm. The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail that provided sample is not approved by the technical committee, so upheld the decision of technical evaluation committee and the status of the firm is still declared as “Non-Responsive” .

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
				<p>and for your reference we are enclosing the audited balance sheet.</p> <p>Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law not provided.</p> <p>We have attached the Undertaking along with our bidding documents, for your reference I am enclosing the same, which I have already attached.</p> <p>Moreover we have agreed to all of your terms and conditions and we have already submitted on the judicial stamp paper that “The undersigned are not blacklisted or facing debarment from any Government, or its organization or project” if department will ask we will submit these terms and conditions on the judicial stamp paper along with sign and stamp, we submit if required again.</p> <p>We request your good self that we should be given one more chance to resubmit the required documents again by the technical committee.</p>	
3.	M/s Strongman Medical Products	Examination Couch/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 08 & 10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sir we have been working in health sector for last 3 decades, even we have supplied more than 700 Delivery Tables to your organization in 2014-15, and more than 2500 units of different items to O&SH in FY 2016-17 of worth >PKR 70 million. We have attached all the audit reports & I/Tax Returns in the BID including the bank certificates, for you connivance, we have attached once again with this letter as Annexure “A”. • Sir we have been working in health sector for last 3 decades, even we have supplied more than 700 Delivery Table to your organization 	Mr. Usama Bin Sabar from M/s Strongman attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Detail of Audit Balance Sheet of last 2 fiscal years & affidavit provided by the firm. The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that the grievance submitted by the firm is hereby accepted and the status of the firm is declared as “Responsive” .

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
				<p>in 2014-15, and more than 2500 units of different items to P&SH in FY 2016-17 of worth >PKR 70 million. We have given the undertaking on Judicial Affidavit of Rs 50+50=100 regarding the Blank Listing of Firm, Acceptance of Bidding Document's Terms & Condition, Bid validity etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please be noted that in the Market now a days Judicial Affidavit is not available of PKR 100, that's why we have attached worth of 50+50=PKR 100.00. This point of rejection is unjustified as the required amount of Judicial Affidavit is as per requirement of Evaluation parameter. 	
4.	M/s Mirza Niaz Muhammad & Sons (MNM)	Examination Couch/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 04 and No. 02 in vendor evaluation criteria. 2% bid security hidden, Warranty not attached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have submitted the original bid security in shape of CDR with commercial proposal, which can be witnessed as and when the commercial process could be initiated. We have clearly mentioned on the covering page of our technical proposal that all the terms and conditions are accepted. Moreover we have stamped and signed all the bidding documents as per the prevailing procedure which is acknowledgement that we are agreed and bound to adhere all the conditions and regulations contain in the standard bidding documents. Furthermore, the evaluation report shows all participating firms have been rejected which demonstrated that the reason of rejecting all the firms is not justified. 	<p>Mr.Ahsan from M/s Mirza Niaz Muhammad & Sons attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Value of 2% bid security of Rs: 60,000 as per bidding documents in shape of CDR (copy) also provided by the firm along with CNIC copy & warranty affidavit.</p> <p>The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that the grievance submitted by the firm is hereby accepted and the status of the firm is declared as "Responsive".</p>

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So you are requested to please reconsider the decision for examination couch in order to justify the fair procurement process accordingly. Moreover, we can provide more document need by the department accordingly. 	
5.	M/s Mirza Niaz Muhammad & Sons (MNM)	Wheel Chair	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 04 and No. 02 in vendor evaluation criteria. Warranty not attached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have submitted the original bid security in shape of CDR with commercial proposal, which can be witnessed as and when the commercial process could be initiated. • We have clearly mentioned on the covering page of our technical proposal that all the terms and conditions are accepted. Moreover we have stamped and signed all the bidding documents as per the prevailing procedure which is acknowledgement that we are agreed and bound to adhere all the conditions and regulations contain in the standard bidding documents. • Furthermore, the evaluation report shows all participating firms have been rejected which demonstrated that the reason of rejecting all the firms is not justified. • So you are requested to please reconsider the decision for examination couch in order to justify the fair procurement process accordingly. Moreover, we can provide more document need by the department accordingly. 	Mr.Ahsan from M/s Mirza Niaz Muhammad & Sons attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Value of 2% bid security of Rs: 80,000 as per bidding documents in shape of CDR (copy) also provided by the firm along with CNIC copy & warranty affidavit. The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that the grievance submitted by the firm is hereby accepted and the status of the firm is declared as “Responsive” .
6.	M/s Thankful Agencies	Wheel Chair/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 04, 09 & 10. 2% Bid security hidden,	1. Our wheel chair technical evaluate as nonresponsive. As the part of clause No. 09, Product evaluation “No” that mean is our product sample is rejected.	Mr. Shoab from M/s Thankful Agencies attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
			Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law not provided	<p>Sir our wheel chair is approved from primary secondary department in every tender under Primary and Secondary Health department like PMU, SMU. As well as our this wheel chair approved from all over the health department of Punjab. We supplied this wheel chair (Qty. 535) in all Punjab through the Primary and Secondary Health PMU department, for your reference we attached the order copies with this letter. We gave the same sample in your departments so may please evaluate our wheel chair sample again and we hope you will be satisfied.</p> <p>As per previous practice of tender of your department, all over the Pakistan that is rule the defaced the bid security amount on photocopy and attached with technical offer. We attached this photocopy of Bid security with defaced amount for your reference if department feel that our Bid security is less than 2 %, as well as you can verify it from Bank.</p> <p>So may please reevaluate our Wheel Chair sample again and we hope you will be satisfied. Your this favor will be highly appreciated.</p>	<p>point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Value of 2% bid security of Rs. 80,000/- as per bidding documents in shape of CDR (copy) also provided by the firm.</p> <p>The committee after due deliberation and discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law was not provided and provided sample is not approved by the technical committee, so upheld the decision of technical evaluation committee and the status of the firm is still declared as “Non-Responsive”.</p>
7.	M/s Thankful Agencies	Examination Couch/ Non Responsive	The firm does not comply with the compulsory parameter No. 04, 09 & 10. 2% bid security hidden, Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law not provided	<p>1. Our Examination technical evaluate as nonresponsive. As the part of clause No. 09, Product evaluation “No” that mean is our product sample is rejected. Our examination couch height is same as approves samples and head raise mechanism is stronger than the approved samples. We use heavy gage pipe you can see the sample which is lying in your honorable office. So may please reevaluate our Examination</p>	<p>Mr. Shoab from M/s Thankful Agencies attended the meeting and presented their grievance to the grievance redressal committee. The committee heard the view point of the representative of the firm which was examined in the light of Technical Evaluation Report. Value of 2% bid security of Rs. 60,000/- as per bidding documents in shape of CDR (copy) also provided by the firm.</p> <p>The committee after due deliberation and</p>

Sr. No.	Name of the Firm	Item/Status	Reason of Rejection	Grievance of the Applicant Firm	Decision of the Committee
				<p>Couch sample again and we hope you will be satisfied.</p> <p>As per previous practice of tender of your department, all over the Pakistan that is rule the defaced the bid security amount on photocopy and attached with technical offer. We attached this photocopy of Bid security with defaced amount for your reference if department feel that our Bid security is less than 2 %, as well as you can verify it from Bank.</p> <p>So may please reevaluate our Examination Couch sample again and we hope you will be satisfied. Your this favor will be highly appreciated.</p>	<p>discussion, keeping in view the required parameters in detail and decided that Undertaking regarding conviction against Court of Law was not provided and provided sample is not approved by the technical committee, so upheld the decision of technical evaluation committee and the status of the firm is still declared as “Non-Responsive”.</p>

Meeting ended with the vote of thanks by the chair