

In pursuance of Secretary W&P department Gilgit-Baltistan Notification No: SWP-GRC-14(15)/2024-285/908 dated 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2024 (copy attached), the Grievances Redressal Committee (GRC) assembled in the Office of the Secretary Water & Power Department Gilgit-Baltistan on 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2024 at 11:30 am to examine the applications submitted by the two (02) aggrieved contractors/firms. M/S Jabbar Engineers (Pvt) Ltd has submitted application against bidding process of Three (03) sub heads: **Supply of Distribution Transformers for W&P Division Hunza & Nagar, Supply of Distribution Transformers for W&P Division Kharmang & Ghanche and Supply of Distribution Transformers for W&P Division Skardu & Shigar** while M/S Shakeeb Traders JV Shah jahan Associates JV Sultan Mehmood & Sons has submitted application against bidding process of sub head : **Supply of Distribution Transformers for W&P Division Hunza & Nagar**. All the sub heads pertain to the development project, "**Supply of distribution Transformers, Smart energy meters & ABC**":-  
**PROCEEDINGS & GRC DECISIONS.**

In order to examine the contents of the applications submitted by the two (02) aggrieved firms, relevant documents were obtained from the concerned Division. Detail of the decision of the evaluation committee and GRC decisions are as under:

| S. No | Name of aggrieved Contractor/firm. | Decision of Bid Evaluation committee.  | Decision of Grievances Redressal Committee (GRC).   |
|-------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1.    | Jabbar Engineers (Pvt) Ltd.        | The contractor was declared non-responsive on the basis of following reasons:<br>i- Less marks obtained in the financial strength. | GRC examined the technical proposal of M/S Jabbar Engineers (Pvt) Ltd. and found that the bid evaluation committee has considered only 1 year financial turnover during evaluation (36 million) and 3.6 marks were awarded to the bidder. whereas sub clause-3 (a/ii) of the evaluation criteria states that, <b>financial turnover for the last three (03) years are to be</b> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>ii- No similar nature project having worth of Rs. 5.00 Million.</p> | <p><b>considered.</b> Financial turnover for the last three (03) years of the bidder is 78.04 million.</p> <p>Therefore, as per re-evaluation of the proposal, the contractor obtained 7.8 marks in financial strength instead of 3.6 million. .</p> <p>GRC examined technical bid of M/S Jabbar Engineers (Pvt) Ltd and it is found that contractor has submitted two (02) start orders worth 7.25 million &amp; 5.98 million issued by MEDEQUIPS Pvt Ltd &amp; MEDICAL EQUIPMENT &amp; SYSTEMS respectively for supply of transformers &amp; related accessories. Net value of Transformers is not clear in the above mentioned start orders. As per sub clause- 3-b/ii of the evaluation criteria, the bidder has to submit supply order of transformers having cost of more than 5.000 million. Applicant/Bidder was called by the GRC and asked him to provide the relevant documents but the bidder failed in providing the requisite documents stating that the attached start order works are still not completed.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|    |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
|    |  |  | <p>The GRC unanimously decided to not include the attached start orders in the experience of the bidder.</p> <p>After re-evaluation of the technical bid, Jabbar Engineers Pvt Ltd obtained 63.1 marks, whereas the qualifying marks are 70. Thus the bidder stands <b>NON RESPONSIVE</b>.</p>   |
| 2. | M/S Shakeeb Traders JV Shah jahan Associates Jv Sultan Mehmood & Sons. | Evaluation committee has not evaluated the bid due to late submission. | <p>GRC examined the application submitted by the JV bidder along with the record/documents provided by the GBHEW division and it is found that the evaluation committee has recorded attendance and endorsed No. (9/12) on the bid but not considered for technical evaluation. Evaluation committee has also recorded the time (11:11am) at which bidder has submitted the bid.</p> <p>Decision of the evaluation committee has made the matter complex. If the bidder has failed in submitting the bid before the cutoff time than the bidder should not be allowed to record the attendance and bid should not be allotted No., which has not been done by the evaluation committee.</p> <p>The GRC unanimously agreed that</p> |





|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>since the evaluation committee has accepted the bid of the aggrieved JV firm by counting of bid and awarded No. (9/12), therefore for transparency of the bidding process and to ensure healthy competition, the bid is required to be evaluated.</p> <p><b>The GRC directed evaluation committee to evaluate the bid as per the criteria mentioned in the bidding documents.</b></p> |
|--|--|--|

Superintending Engineer (Works)  
Chief Engineer Office Gilgit region  
**(Member)**

Rep of Planning & Development Department  
Department GB  
**(Member)**

Rep of Finance Department GB  
**(Member)**

Additional Secretary,  
Water & Power Department GB  
**(Member)**

Chief Engineer  
Water & Power Department Baltistan Region  
**(Chairman)**