GRC Report

(As Per Rule 38 of GBPPRA)

1.	Name of Procuring Agency	Water and Power Department GB
2.	Method of Procurement	Single Stage Two Envelope (SSTE)
3.	Title of Procurement	ICB-01 EPC/Turnkey Contracts for Implementation of Rooftop Solarization of Gilgit Baltistan (18.15 MWDC, in 3 Lots)
4.	Tender Inquiry No.	No. PD/100MW/SPP/1(1)/2025/ 498
5.	GB PPRA Ref. No	**TSE-202511222144**
6.	Date and Time of Bid Closing	1330 hrs (Pakistan Standard Time) on December 26, 2025
7.	Date and Time of Bid Opening	1400 hrs (Pakistan Standard Time) on December 26, 2025
8.	No. of Bids Received	11 (Lot-I)+14 (Lot-II) +6 (Lot-III)
9.	Criteria for Bid Evaluation	Responsive/Non-Responsive as per the Criteria stipulated in the Bidding Documents (Including Addendum if any)
10.	Details of Bid(s) Evaluation	As Below:

The Grievance Redressal Committee report is attached below.

Signature: _____

Official Stamp: Project Director
100 MWp DPV Solar Project
Gilgit-Baltistan

GOVERNMENT OF GILGIT-BALTISTAN
GILGIT-BALTISTAN SECRETARIAT
(WATER & POWER DEPARTMENT GB)

No. SWP-PSDP-1(3)/2023-24/1092 Gilgit dated 29th January, 2026

To,

The Project Director,
100MW Solar Power Project Gilgit-Baltistan

Subject: **GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS FOR "100MW DISTRIBUTION SOLAR (PV) PLANTS".**

I am directed to refer to the Chairman GRC/Chief Engineer, Water & Power Gilgit Region letter No. CE-W&P/GRC-4(56)/2025/2089 dated 28th January, 2026 on the subject cited above and to say that recommendations of the Grievance Redressal Committee constituted for bidding process of Rooftop component under the PSDP Project titled, ***"Development of a project having cumulative capacity of 100MW Distributed Solar (PV) Plants across Gilgit-Baltistan."*** The recommendations of the committee have been approved by the PAO/Secretary, Water & Power Department Gilgit-Baltistan, Gilgit.

2. Therefore it is requested to process further for necessary action as per rules, please

(SYED ZAGAM ABBAS)
Section Officer (PSDP)
W&P Department GB
Ph: 05811-920964

Copy to:

1. The Chairman GRC/ Chief Engineer, W&P Gilgit Region, Gilgit.
2. PS to the Secretary, Water & Power Department, GB, Gilgit.

The following Bidders Submitted Grievances against the Technical Evaluation Report:

Lot-I:

1. M/s Hussain Ali & Sons, NIMIR and Ahmad Global Construction Company (JV)
2. M/s Muhammad Yousaf & Sons – PANTERA (JV)
3. M/s Solar Tech.
4. M/s SC Technology Global (Pvt) – Broshall Associates (JV)
5. M/s MAZCORP – HUBEI (JV)

Lot-II:

1. M/s Hussain Ali & Sons, ECUBE and Ahmad Global Construction Company (JV)
2. M/s Zulfiqar Ali Sadpara – Shah & Company – ZEUS Energy (JV)
3. M/s Muhammad Yousaf & Sons – PANTERA (JV)
4. M/s AAJ Sons Private Ltd Skardu – Haji Ghulam Hussain & Sons (JV)
5. M/s Ahmed &Co.
6. M/s Unique – Elite (JV)
7. M/s Sympl Energy – NEPCON PVT LTD – Sargodha Construction (JV)

Lot-III:

1. M/s Muhammad Yousaf & Sons – PANTERA (JV)
2. M/s JANAN-PAKRELIABLE-SAFFRON Joint Venture
3. M/s Gallopers-Damaan Joint Venture

Pursuant to notification by the Chairman GRC, two hearings for the "aggrieved bidders" were held under the Chairmanship of GRC on 22nd and 26th January 2026. Some Bidders were appeared before GRC in person / or through authorized representatives while the others attended the hearing via zoom link.

The attendance sheets are attached as ready references.

After, detailed hearing process, going through the Technical Proposals and the clarifications submitted by the aggrieved bidders, the unanimous recommendation of GRC members are as tabulated below:

Sr. No.	Firm	Lot	Technical Evaluation	Grievance(s)	Decision
1	**Hussain Ali and Sons-Nimir-Ahmad**	I	In response to the clarification sought, information regarding Current Commitments has been provided by all JV Members and revised Net Financial resource comes to PKR 1,107 Million against PKR 400 Million. furthermore, Financial Statements of M/s NIMIR have also been provided. However, Unique Documents Identification Number (UDIN) of JV members except NIMIR for all three years have not been provided, hence non-conforming the requirements of Bidding Documents.	Financial Capabilities, as sought in the Clarification Letter, we submitted a letter from our Auditor clearly stating that the required process takes approximately two to three working days to complete. This letter was duly attached with our clarification response. Subsequently, on the very next day, we submitted the required document (NDIN) in full compliance.	The JV was Disqualified on the basis of non-provision of Unique Documents Identification Number (UDIN). Clarification was sought by the Bids Evaluation Committee (BEC) for provision of UDIN within 2 days. The GRC verified that the Bidder / JV has provided the requisite UDIN as per their commitment. Further, the UDIN is simply a verification code for verification of Audit Reports and does not change the substance of Bid as envisaged in Rule 34 (1) GBPPRA 2022. Therefore, the GRC declares the JV as **Response / Qualified.**

2	***Hussain Ali and Sons Ecube-Ahmad***	II	In response to the Clarification, information regarding Current Commitments has been provided by all JV members and revised Net Financial resource comes to PKR 1,047 Million against PKR 230 Million furthermore Financial Statements of M/s ECUBE have also been provided. However, UDIN for all JV partners for all the required three years have not been provided, hence non-conforming the requirements of Bidding Documents. Inverter: Bidder has not provided details of at least One Manufacturer listed under BNEF Tier 1 (Q2 or Q3 of 2025) or with experience of more than 03 years of manufacturing along-with 2 GW of sales during the last two years. Please provide the requisite details or the bid will be considered as non-responsive and subject to rejection. BESS: Bidder has not provided details of at least one manufacturer listed under BNEF Tier 1(Q2 or Q3 of 2025) or with experience of more than 03 years of manufacturing along-with 2 GWh of sales during the last two years. Please provide the requisite details or the bid will be considered as non-responsive and subject to rejection. In response to clarification, Bidder has provided with the one manufacturer but did not attach experience detail along with 2 GWh of sales. Hence, found non responsive.	Regarding Sub-Factor 3.1 – Financial Capabilities: With respect to Sub-Factor 3.1 – Financial Capabilities, as sought in your clarification letter, we submitted a letter from our Auditor clearly stating that the required process takes approximately two to three working days to complete. This letter was duly attached with our clarification response. Subsequently, on the very next day, we submitted the required document in full compliance. 2. Regarding ITB 32.2 and Section IV – Technical Bid Form (TECH-6): The required documentation under these provisions was duly prepared, attached, and submitted along with our clarification response. For your ease of reference and record, we are once again enclosing the same documents as Annex-A with this application.	The Scrutiny of documents revealed that the JV has proposed same manufacturer for provision of Inverter and BESS in both Lots I & II. The Bids Evaluation Committee has qualified the same Manufacturer in Lot-I. The clarification submitted by the Bidders also demonstrates that the Manufacturer falls in Tier 1 and qualifies the prescribed criteria of the Tender Documents. The claim of the Bidder/JV since stands substantiated as the Bid Evaluation Committee has accepted the same Manufacturer as responsive in Lot-I therefore, the GRC declares the JV as **Responsive / Qualified.**

3	**MYS-Panters**	I,II,III	In response to the clarification, information regarding UDIN have been provided but current commitments provided by all JV members and revised Net Financial resource comes to negative PKR 63 Million against minimum of PKR 230 Million in Lot III. hence, non-conforming the requirements of Bidding Documents.	The bidder submitted Grievance that it meets the Financial *Requirements*	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to *the clarifications* sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

4	***Janan-Pak Reliable***	III	NC1: • The JV member M/s Pak Reliable Engineering has submitted audited financial statements for the years 2023 to 2025; however, the UDIN for the year 2025 is missing in the Auditor's Report. • The JV member M/s Jannan & Sons (SMC-Pvt) Ltd has submitted audited financial statements for the years 2023 to 2025 without UDIN. In addition, the comparative figures shown in the financial statements for the year 2024 do not reconcile with the corresponding figures of 2023. • The JV member M/s Safroon Energy (Pvt) ltd has submitted audited financial statements for the years 2023 to 2025 without UDIN. Moreover, the comparative figures for the years 2023, 2024, and 2025 do not match the corresponding figures for the preceding years. Furthermore, the Auditor's Report for the year 2025 is not attached, and the financial statements for all three years are not signed by the Management of M/s Safroon Energy (Pvt) ltd. In response to the post Bid clarification, all JV members except M/s Pak Reliable Engineering has not provided UDIN, hence non conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents NC2: The Bidder has attached a Work Order for a 145 kW Hybrid Battery Storage Solar System. However, the submission does not specify the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) capacity (kWh) of the proposed EP11 FOXESS Lithium-ion Battery model. In response to the post Bid clarification,	Auditor's response regarding provision of UDNI was submitted to the PD Office and principally it was agreed that the submission of clarification will be met on 16.01.2026.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

			the Bidder has not provided the requisite documents, hence non-conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents The Bidder has not mentioned the Bid validity date in the Letter of Technical Bid. As well as the amount of Bid Security has been inadvertently mentioned in the Letter of Technical Bid as PKR 18 million instead of PKR 5 million. The Bidder has provided Bid Security of PKR 5 million for Lot III bidding. In response to the post Bid clarification, the Bidder has not provided the requisite documents, hence non conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents S2: The Bidder (All JV Members) has not provided Organizational Chart, List of Board of Directors and Beneficial Ownership Disclosure Form. Design Methodology is not attached as per Bidding Documents. In response to the post Bid clarification, the Bidder has not provided the Design Methodology, hence non-conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents NC2: Specific plant data list is attached but not duly filled (Bidder response at column 'B' is not filled). In response to the post Bid clarification, the Bidder has not provided the filled Specific Plant data, hence non-conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents NC3: Mobilization Schedule is not attached as per Bidding Documents. In response to the post Bid clarification, the Bidder has not provided the		

			Mobilization schedule, hence non-conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents NC4: PV Modules: Bidder has not provided details of at least one manufacturer with Tier 1 listing of BNEF Q2 or Q3. Inverter: Bidder has not provided details of at least one manufacturer with experience of more than 03 years of manufacturing along with 2 GW of sales during the last two years. BESS: Bidder has not provided details of at least one manufacturer with experience of more than 03 years of manufacturing along with 2 GWh of sales during the last two years. In response to the post Bid clarification, the Bidder has not provided the requisite documents, hence non-conforming to the requirements of the Bidding Documents.		

5	**Solar tech**	I	The Bidder has net financial resources of PKR 1,093 million against PKR 400 million threshold considering available credit line of 760 million mentioned in Fin-Form 3.1, however, the bidder has not attached supporting bank letters for credit line.• The bidder is not submitted Financial Statements for the year 2025, which is required to ascertain most recent financial soundness.In response to Post-Bid Clarification, the Bidder has submitted as under:"We have already provided file FIN-Form 3.1 at page 137 in which last three year financial statement (2021-2022, 2022-2023, 2023-2024) however now we are providing Bank Credit Line Limit amounts 760 Millions and Audit statement (2022-2023, 2023-2024, 2024-2025). The copy of same is attached as Annex B"Upon evaluation of the submitted documents regarding financial statement for the year 2025 it is found that the net liquid assets reduced as compared to previous year in addition line of credit amounting PKR 760 million as claimed is mostly comprising of letter of credit / guarantees and only has line of credit amounting PKR 100 million. Resultantly net financial resource comes to be PKR 281 million against PKR 400 million as per requirement of the Bidding Documents stated in factor 3.1 (i) [Financial Capabilities] of Section III of Eligibility and Qualification Criteria, thus does not conform the stipulated requirement.	Against requirement of PKR 400.0 M we are providing financial evidence of 966.0 M which clearlyproves our financial strength along with cash flow state for smooth execution of project.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

6	**ZAS-SHAH-ZEUS**	II	The Bidder has submitted the Letter of Technical Bid without signing, thus not meeting the requirements of the Bidding Documents (ITB 30.1). NC2: The Bidder has submitted the Power of Attorney (not on a stamp paper), without signing and stamp, thus not meeting the requirements of the Bidding Documents. NC3: The Bidder has submitted with its Bid "Consortium Agreement" whereas in accordance with the Bidding Documents, it was required to submit "Joint Venture Agreement". The submitted Consortium Agreement states the following: " 4.5 For the avoidance of doubt it is hereby clarified that the all Members of the consortium shall be held individually responsible for the obligation mentioned in [Schedule 2] regarding their specific roles/responsibilities undertaken by them under this Agreement. " 7.1 Liability towards each other: The Members hereby understand and agree that each Member shall be individually liable for any default with regard to the deliverables of his part under the terms and conditions of the Contract [Schedule 2] and the Tender Document." The Bidder has submitted the Letter of Technical Bid without signing and stamp. Moreover, Power of Attorney has also not been signed. Therefore, following confirmations regarding 'Conflict of Interest', 'Debarment/Blacklisting' and 'Suspension Based on Execution of	The JV has fulfilled all the Codal Formalities and still declared as Non-Responsive / Disqualified.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

			Bid/Bid Securing Declaration by the Employer' cannot be confirmed, thus not meeting the requirements of the Bidding Documents. NC2: • The JV has combined net financial resource of PKR 135 million against PKR 230 million threshold mentioned in bidding criteria. The credit line letter of Habib Metro bank amounting to PKR 150 million is outdated. Latest letter with date is required for consideration in cash flow calculation. • The Bidder M/s Zulfiqar Ali Sadpara has not attached Current Contract Commitments/work in progress Form, which is compulsory for calculation of Cash flows/Financial Resources. • The Bidder M/s Shah and Co have not attached Current Contract Commitments/work in progress Form, which is compulsory for calculation of Cash flows/Financial Resources. • UDIN, which is mandatory requirement as per bidding criteria, is not provided by all JV members for latest three financial years. • Moreover, Bidder M/s Shah & Co and M/S Zeus Energy Private Limited have not provided Financial Statements for 2025. Financial Statement of year 2025 is required to ascertain most recent financial soundness. C3: The Bidder has not substantiated BESS experience for the successful execution document issued by "R&S Engineering and Services (SMC) Pvt. Ltd". Manufacture Authorization Missing for PV, BESS and Inverter PV Modules. Noted that at least one		

			proposed manufacturer complies with the requirement of Tier 1 Manufacturer in Q2 or Q3 of BNEF Listing. However, letter of authorization shall be required from the proposed manufacturer. • Inverter: Noted that at least one proposed manufacturer complies with the requirement of Tier 1 Manufacturer in Q2 or Q3 of BNEF Listing. However, letter of authorization shall be required from the proposed manufacturer. • BESS: Noted that at least one proposed manufacturer complies with the requirement of Tier 1 Manufacturer in Q2 or Q3 of BNEF Listing. However, letter of authorization shall be required from the proposed manufacturer.		

7	***Ahmad and Co***	II	*UDIN, which is mandatory requirement as per bidding criteria, is not provided by the Bidder.* In Response to post clarification, the Bidder failed to provide the UDIN number, hence non-conforming to the the requirements of the Bidding Documents. NC2: The Bidder has not substantiated BESS experience (capacity) as required under Clause 4.1 (b) of Section III– Evaluation and Qualification Criteria for Lot-II for the projects stated in the Bidder. In Response to post clarification, the documents provided by the Bidder does not demonstrate the substantiation of size/capacity of cumulative BESS installation of ≥500 kWh.	The Experience details submitted with our Bid demonstrate that the cumulative installed BESS Capacity is equal to or greater than 500 Kwh. Fulfillment of Technical Criteria, UDIN.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

8	**Unique -Elite**	II	NC1: JV member (Unique Construction) is registered with PEC in CA but documents and online verification reflect expiry date as June 30, 2025. In response to the post Bid clarification the Bidder has stated as under:"The PEC renewal application is under process and challans fee and documents submitted on 12th Nov 2025. Copy of the submission receipt is attached. Acknowledgement of renewal fee deposit is also attached".In light of above response, it is clear that the JV member (Unique Construction) did not have valid PEC License on the date of submission of Bid. The requirements regarding PEC licensing stipulated in ITB Sub-Clause 4.2 is as under:"The Bidder (single entity or each member in the JV) shall be duly licensed by the Pakistan Engineering Council (PEC). In case, the Bidder is a single entity it shall have valid PEC licence in category C1 and in case of JV, the combined value of limitsof all the JV members shall not be less than that of C1"Thus, the Bidder (JV) is non-compliant with the PEC licensing requirements due to the absence of a valid PEC licence for one of the JV members.C2: JV member (Elite Engineering Pvt. Ltd.) is registered with PEC in CA but submitted PEC certificate reflects expiry date as June 30, 2025, however online verification reflects it is valid till June 30, 2028.In response to the post Bid clarification, information regarding current commitments has been provided by all JV members and revised net financial resource comes to PKR4,802 million against PKR 230 million.	The Joint Venture is fully compliant with ITB Sub-Clause 4.2 concerning PEC licensing;· The financial capability criteria under Section III are duly met; and· There exists no material deviation, omission, or reservation that would affect the scope, quality, legality, or execution of the Project.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

			However, M/s UNIQUE Constructions haveprovided new financial statements with change in Auditor and financial data, hence non-conforming the requirements of Bidding Documents.		

9	**SCT-Broshal**	I	As per ITB Sub-Clause IB 13.1 "The Bidder shall complete the Letter of Technical Bid and Letter of Financial Bid using the relevant forms furnished in Section IV (Bid Forms). The forms must be completed without any alterations to the text, and no substitutes shall be accepted except as provided under ITB 21.3. All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested." Whereas, the Letter of Technical Bid was not found attached with the Bid, thus does not conforms to the stipulated requirement.NC3: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(d), the Bidder has to submit written confirmation authorizing the signatory of the Bid to commit the Bidder, in accordance with ITB 21.1 whereas signature of the authorized person is missing. NS4: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(f), the Bidder has to submit Form ELI 1.2 form along-with its attachments whereas Beneficial Ownership Disclosure Form is not provided as per required format. NC5: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(h), in the case of a Technical Bid submitted by a JV, JV agreement, indicating at least the parts of the Works to be executed by the respective members need to be submitted whereas scope & responsibilities of each member are not mentioned in the JV Agreement submitted by the Bidder as well as it also do not reflect the participation and share percentage. NC6: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(f), the Bidder has to submit Form Tech 6 with its Bid whereas List of subcontractors is attached but documentary evidence	The observations are general in nature and relate primarily to documentations, clarifications or interpretations gaps rather any fundamental Technical or Financial incapacity of our firm /JV.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

			for list of completed projects has not been provided As per ITB Sub-Clause IB 13.1 "The Bidder shall complete the Letter of Technical Bid and Letter of Financial Bid using the relevant forms furnished in Section IV (Bid Forms). The forms must be completed without any alterations to the text, and no substitutes shall be accepted except as provided under ITB 21.3. All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested." Whereas, the Letter of Technical Bid was not found attached with the Bid. NC3: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(e), each member of JV has to submit Form CON- 2, whereas the said Form found not attached in the Bid. NC4: Fin-Form 3.1 and Fin-Form 3.2 are not submitted by the JV member M/s SCT Global. In addition, it has not attached Current Contract Commitments/work in progress Form, which is compulsory for calculation of Cash flows/Financial Resources. NC5: The JV member M/s SCT Global has not attached Audited Financial Statement for 2025 which is required to ascertain recent financial soundness. NC6: Financial Form as well as Audited Financial Statements for the JV member M/s Broshall Associates are not attached with the Bid. NC7: The Bidder has not furnished the documents, to establish completion (on Client's letterhead), for the claimed projects in the Bid, as required under 4.1b) Section III–Evaluation and Qualification Criteria for Lot-I. NC8: For the experience of 1MWh BESS		

			deployment for M/s Ufone Pakistan, breakup of 1MWh to ascertain the requirement is not provided with the Bid, as required under 4.1b) Section III– Evaluation and Qualification Criteria for Lot-I. The Bidder has provided Specific plant data list but not duly filled his response at column 'B' C2: Bidder has submitted List of subcontractors but documentary evidence for list of completed projects has not been provided. BESS: Bidder has not provided details of at least one manufacturer with experience of more than 03 years of manufacturing along with 2 GWh of sales during the last two years.		

10	**Sympal Energy**	II	Two of the JV members (NEPCON and Sargodha Construction) have not provided "Organization Chart, and Declaration of Beneficial Ownership) with the Bid. C2: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(e), each member of JV has to submit Form CON-2 [Historical Contract Non-Performance, Pending Litigation and Litigation History], whereas the JV member (Sympl Energy) has not filled in the FORM CON 2 and marked it as "NOT APPLICABLE". Remaining two JV partners (NEPCON and Sargodha Construction) have not submitted Form CON 2. Please Clarify. The JV has combined net financial resources of negative PKR 852 million against PKR 230 million threshold mentioned in bidding criteria. In addition, Sargodha Construction have not attached Current Contract Commitments/work in progress Form, which is compulsory for calculation of Cash flows/Financial Resources. Audited Financial Statement of M/s Sympl Energy for 2025 is not provided, however management accounts are attached which is not acceptable for evaluation. UDIN for year 2023 is also not provided for M/s Sympl Energy. Auditor's Report of M/s NEPCON is missing for year 2025 and UDIN for year 2024 is not verified by ICAP.	Compliance with Working and Available Capital Requirement, The cited clause (Sub-Factor 3.1) pertains to the working and available capital requirement for execution of the project. As per the Bidding Documents, the required funding for the subject project is PKR 230 million. The available cashflow of our Joint Venture, as submitted in our bid, amounts to PKR 488,264,778, which meets the stipulated requirement.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

11	**Gallopers-Damaan**	III	NC1: Letter of Technical Bid is not signed which is major omission.S2: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(f), the Bidder has to submit Form ELI 1.2 form along-with its attachments whereas the Bidder's JV member (Daman Builders Private Limited) has not provided Organizational Chart and List of Board of Directors. C3: As per ITB Sub-Clause 12.2(h), in the case of a Technical Bid submitted by a JV, JV agreement, indicating at least the parts of the Works to be executed by the respective members need to be submitted whereas scope & responsibilities of each member are not mentioned in the JV Agreement submitted by the Bidder. The JV have combined net financial resource of PKR 1,566 million against PKR 155 million threshold mentioned in bidding criteria however, both JV members have not attached Current Contract Commitments/work in progress Form, whichis compulsory for calculation of Cash flows/Financial Resources. S1: UDIN, which is mandatory requirement as per bidding criteria, are not provided by both JV members for latest three financial years. Clarification is being issued for missing UDIN.The JV member M/s Damaan Builders have not provided Audited Financial Statements for the year 2025 which is required to ascertain recent financial soundness. In addition, the said JV member has provided its own Audited FinancialStatement for the year 2024 only. Audited Financial Statement of M/s Zafar Associates is provided by M/s Damaan Builders for	To address the Committee's observations, we provide the following clause-wise clarification:1. ITB 12.2(a) and ITB 13 – Mandatory Bid DocumentsAll required documents, including the Letter of Technical Bid, JV Agreement, Power of Attorney, and other mandatory submissions, were included exactly as required, without deviation or alteration. These documents were placed in the prescribed sequence.2. ITB 20.1 read with Bid Data Sheet – Bid SecurityThe Bid Security submitted by the JV fully complied with the specified requirements, including the correct amount, prescribed format, validity period, and issuance by a scheduled bank in Pakistan. No deficiency existed in the Bid Security.3. ITB 4.4 – Conflict of Interest. The JV has no conflict of interest under any sub-clause of ITB 4.4. None of the JV partners, subcontractors, or associated entities participated in any competing bid, nor do we share any representation, control, or relationship with any other bidder.4. ITB 4.7 – Blacklisting / DebarmentBoth JV partners and all declared subcontractors submitted valid affidavits confirming that none are blacklisted, debarred, or suspended by PEC, PPRA, GBPPRA, or any other agency.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

			the year 2022 & 2023.Form TECH 2• Specific Plant data list is attached but not duly filled (Bidder response at column 'B' isnot filled)	These affidavits were included in the technical submission.5. ITB 4.9 – *Suspension / IneligibilityThe* JV and its members are not suspended, restricted, or declared ineligible under any applicable procurement rules. All required registrations, tax compliance documents, and PEC licenses were valid and included.6. Section III, Sub-Factor 3.1 – Financial CapabilityThe JV fully meets the required financial criteria, including average annual turnover, working capital, financial resources, positive net worth, and audited financial statements for the past three years. All financial forms (FIN-3.1 and FIN-3.2) were completed and submitted.	

12	**Aajsons**	II	In response to the post Bid clarification, information regarding current commitments has been provided by all JV members and revised net financial resource comes to PKR 4595 million against PKR 230 million but UDIN have not been provided by all JV members hence, non-conforming the requirements of Bidding Documents. In Response to post clarification, the documents provided by the Bidder does not demonstrate the substantiation of size /capacity of project mentioned in serial no.1 and did not provide the requisite information regarding projects given under serial no. 2 & 3. Hence, does not comply with the Bidders experience of Cumulative PV installation capacity of ≥ 1.5 MW DC. In Response to post clarification, the documents provided by the Bidder does not demonstrate the substantiation regarding completion of projects mentioned under serial no. 3 & 4 hence, does not comply with the requirements stated under factor 4.1 (a) of Section III Evaluation and Qualification Criteria. NC4: Mobilization Schedule is not attached In response to post clarification, Bidder has submitted Master Schedule indicating 270 working days instead of 195 days. This does not comply with the Time for completion for the Works. Hence, Bidder did not comply with the requirements pf theBidding Documents	While the technical evaluation report notes disqualification on three points, we have adequate evidence to substantiate compliance and confirm our qualification for the subject works.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

13	**Mazcorp-HUBEI JV**	I	As per ITB Sub-Clause 4.2 which states that "The Bidder (single entity or each member in the JV) .... a foreign firm may submit a valid PEC provisional license in a relevant category with its Bid..." whereas the Bidder's JV member's (M/s Hubei Industrial Construction Group Installation Engineering Co., Ltd) Provisional PEC is not found attached with the Bid. In response to the Post-Bid Clarifications, the Bidder has not furnished the Provisional Pakistan Engineering Council (PEC) License of its Joint Venture member, M/s Hubei Industrial Construction Group Installation Engineering Co., Ltd. In accordance with ITB Sub-Clause 4.2 and Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria of the Bidding Documents, it is mandatory that the Bidder, whether as a single entity or each member of a Joint Venture, meets the PEC licensing requirements whereas the Bidder does not meet the said requirements. Accordingly, this constitutes non-conformance to the requirements of Bidding Documents.	One Member of JV is duly licenced with PEC and the foreign Partner has already initiated the Formal PEC Registration / Enrolment. Review and reconsider the technical evaluation decision; and - Restore the technical responsiveness of M/s MAZCORP-HUBEI JV; or - Allow submission and verification of supplementary documentary evidence relating to PEC registration, in line with PPRA principles of fairness, transparency, and competition.	The Scrutiny of documents provided by the JV in response to the clarifications sought by the BEC and the Technical Proposal of the Bidder, the GRC upholds the decision of BEC and declares the JV as **Non-Responsive / Disqualified.**

Engr. Niamat Khan
PD 16 MW HPP Naltar-III, Gilgit

Ghulam Mohammad
DS (Dev), W&P GB

Mr. Moazzam Ali Shah
Assistant Chief (Power), P&DD GB

Engr. Abrar Hussain
XEN, W&P GBHEW Division Gilgit

Engr. Shabab Wahid Khan,
Chief Engineer W&P GB – Gilgit Region