

Minutes of Meeting of Grievance Redressal for Medical Devices (Local Manufacturers & Sole Agents of Foreign Principle)

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
1	46	Disposable Syringe 10ml with needle and leur lock/slip	Amson Vaccines and Pharma (Private) Ltd	Non-Responsive	<p>2% bid security could not be verified.</p> <p>Undertaking regarding adulterated not attached.</p> <p>Free Sale Certificate is not for two years.</p> <p>Document for three years experience not attached.</p> <p>Undertaking regarding spurious/ adulterated batch not attached.</p> <p>End user rejected the product on the basis of quality.</p> <p>Does not obtain qualifying marks.</p>	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that:</p> <p>i. According to PPRA two envelop bidding procedure bidder submit two sealed envelop one containing technical proposal and other financial proposal enclosed together in outer single envelop. Financial proposal contain earnest money. Following this procedure they have attached bid security with financial proposal. In bidding documents it is not indicated that the bid security or even copy of bid security to be attached with technical proposal. They were requesting for acceptance of technical bid. Financial bid should be rejected if bid security is not found at the time of financial bid.</p> <p>ii. Free sale certificate has been attached with technical and attaching again with this requirement of free sale is not applicable in case of local manufacturer as local manufacturer is already providing an evidence of sale in pakistan.</p> <p>iii. It has attached undertaking of non-declaration of spurious/adulterated batch by DTL of Punjab.</p> <p>iv. It has attached certificates and testing reports of needle manufacturer from where they are purchasing the syringes.</p> <p>v. It has attached experience of quoted product which is 5.2million pcs.</p> <p>vi. It has local market experience more than 5 years since their registration 2011.</p> <p>In view of above they are requesting to re-evaluate and declared us as responsive for maximum competition.</p>	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Aqeel and Mr. Faisal appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined.</p> <p>The firm presented the copy of CDR which is 2% of estimated cost which is accepted by the committee.</p> <p>Free sale certificate submitted by the firm is of last two years.</p> <p>In addition report of end user (Professor of Ganga Ram Teaching Hospital) approved the product on sample evaluation.</p> <p>Moreover, Undertaking submitted by the firm is for spurious batch which is acceptable.</p> <p>The firm provided documents/purchase orders which establish that the product is available in market from last three years so 15 marks given to the firm for market experience.</p> <p>Therefore, the greivance of the firm was accepted. Hence the status of the firm is declared as "Responsive" after obtaining 30 marks.</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
2	47	Disposable Syringe 5ml with needle and leur lock/slip	The Searle Company Limited	Non-Responsive	Free sale certificate is not for last two years. Document for three years experience regarding quoted product not attached. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not attached. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality. Does not obtain qualifying marks.	The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that: i. It has attached Free sale certificate along with technical bid but not accepted by committee attaching again with grievance application. ii. It has attached document for three years experience regarding quoted product but not considered by committee. iii. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not considered. iv. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality. v. Its product is approved in jinnah hospital lahore. We have attached relevant documents again for consideration.	Representative of the firm Mr. Ahmed Iqbal Khan appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents: i. Free sale certificate ii. Availability of product in three other countries. 3 Marks awarded instead of 1. iii. Bidder manufacturer relationship is more than 2 years. Hence 7 marks given instead of 5. Invoice regarding availability of product in local market are of 2018. Hence no marks given. Moreover, the representative of the firm himself admitted that they don't have sale of quoted item in market as well as in institute for last three years. Invoices provided are for the year 2018 only. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch is for two years, which was accepted. Undertaking on judicial stamp paper was provided regarding substandard batch of quoted item which was accepted. Hence 10 marks awarded. Total marks of the firm became 21. In addition end user also reject the product on sample evaluation. Keeping in view of above the grievance of the firm is rejected. Hence, the status of the firm remain " Non-Responsive ".

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
3	48	Disposable Insulin Syringe 1ml with needle	B. Braun Pakistan Private Limited	Non-Responsive	<p>Free Sale Certificate not attached. Documents for three years product experience not attached. Undertaking regarding spurious/ adulterated not attached. Undertaking regarding blacklisting/ debarred not attested. Does not obtain qualifying marks.</p>	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. It has surprised the firm regarding rejection of insuline syringes 1cc. The firm has quoted the said item on quality basis exactly according to demand specified under list. ii. It has attached following documents iii. Free sale certificate iv. Undertaking original legal paper attested by notarypublic v. Documents regarding trade market and institutional Experience . 	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Rehan and Mr. Aftab appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee found that the undertaking regarding spurious/adulterated batch submitted by the firm is accepted. The firm submitted the PO of Shaheen Medical Services, shaheen foundation PAF complex. Hence 5 marks given in this catagory. However, the firm failed to produce the following compulsory documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Free sale certificate for last two years. ii. Documents regarding experience of quoted product for last three year. iv. Experience of quoted product in developed/other countries. <p>Therefor, the grievance of the firm is rejected. Hence, status of quoted item of the firm is declared as "Non-responsive".</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
4	48	Disposable Insulin Syringe 1ml with needle	The Searle Company Limited	Non-Responsive	<p>Free sale certificate is not for last two years. Document for three years experience regarding quoted product not attached. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not attached.</p> <p>End user rejected the product on the basis of quality.</p> <p>Does not obtain qualifying marks.</p>	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that:</p> <p>i. It has attached Free sale certificate along with technical bid but not accepted by committee attaching again with grievance..</p> <p>ii. It has attached documents for three years experience regarding quoted product but not considered by committee.</p> <p>iii. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not considered.</p> <p>iv. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality.</p> <p>v. Its product is approved in jinnah hospital lahore.</p> <p>It has attached relevant documents again for consideration.</p>	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Ahmed Iqbal Khan appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents:</p> <p>i. Free sale certificate.</p> <p>ii. Availability of product in three other countries. 2 Marks awarded instead of 0.</p> <p>iii. Bidder manufacturer relationship is more than 2 years. Hence 7 marks given instead of 5.</p> <p>Invoice regarding availability of product in local market area of 2018. Hence no marks given.</p> <p>Moreover, the representative of the firm himself admitted that they don't have sale of quoted item in market as well as in institutions for last three years. Invoices provided are for the year 2018 only.</p> <p>Undertaking regarding adulterated batch is for two years, which was accepted.</p> <p>Undertaking on judicial stamp paper was provided regarding substandard batch of quoted item which was accepted. Hence, 10 marks awarded. Total marks of the firm became 22.</p> <p>In addition the end user also rejected the product on sample evaluation.</p> <p>Keeping in view the above, grievance of the firm is rejected. Hence the status of the quoted item of firm remains as "Non-Responsive".</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
5	49	I.V. Cannula with Injection Port and Integrated Closing Cone Size 22G	B. Braun Pakistan Private Limited	Non-Responsive	Undertaking regarding blacklisting/ debarred not attested. Does not obtain qualifying marks.	<p>The firm has requested to accept the undertaking attested and legalised which was not attested before due to clerical mistake.</p> <p>They have not given marks of following documents which were already attached with technical bid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Experience of quoted products since july 2017 to june 2018 ii. Quality of products iii. Bidder manufacturer relationship iv. Compliance of quality standard v. Availability of quoted product. 	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Rehan and Mr. Aftab appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Undertaking regarding blacklisting/debarred legalised and notarized on stamp paper. ii. Quality CE certificate is valid. Hence 5 marks given in this category. iii. Undertaking regarding quality of product provided on stamp paper. 10 marks given for this. iv. Documents submitted for bidder manufacturer relationship is more than 5 years. Hence 10 marks given in this category. v. Experience of quoted product in three countries. 3 Marks awarded for this vi. The claim of the firm regarding sale of quoted item could not be verified as submitted documents show sale less than 60% of advertized quantity. Total marks of the firm became 43. <p>Therefore, the grievance of the firm is accepted. Hence, status of quoted item of firm is declared as "Responsive".</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
6	49	I.V. Cannula with Injection Port and Integrated Closing Cone Size 22G	The Searle Company Limited	Non-Responsive	Free sale certificate is not for last two years. Document for three years experience regarding quoted product not attached. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not attached. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality.Does not obtain qualifying marks.	The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that: i. It has attached Free sale certificate along with technical bid but not accepted by committee so attaching again with grievance application. ii. It has attached document for three years experience regarding quoted product but not considered by committee. iii. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not considered. iv. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality. Their product is approved in DHQ sahiwal and sargodha. They have attached relavent documents again for consideration.	Representative of the firm Mr. Ahmed Iqbal Khan appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents: i. Free sale certificate ii. Availability of product in two other countries. 2 Marks awarded instead of 0. iii. Bidder manufacturer relationship is more than 2 years. Hence, 7 marks given instead of 5. Invoices regarding availability of product in local market are of 2015. Hence 10 marks given. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch is for two years. Undertaking on judicial stamp paper was provided regarding substandard batch of quoted item. 10 marks awarded. Total marks of the firm became 39. Moreover, the end user (Professor of Ganga Ram Teaching Hospital) approved the product in sample evaluation. Keeping in view of above the grievance of the firm is accepted. Hence the status of quoted item of firm is declared as " Responsive ".

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
7	50	I.V. Cannula with Integrated Closing Cone Size 24G	B. Braun Pakistan Private Limited	Non-Responsive	Undertaking regarding blacklisting/ debarred not attested. Undertaking regarding spurious/ adulterated not attested.	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and requested to accept the undertaking attested and legalised which was not attested before due to clerical mistake.</p> <p>The firm also aggrieved about the decision of technical evaluation committee against the acceptance of IV cannula 24 G of competitor (M/s Lab link enterprises) as in advertised specification IV cannula 24G with integrated closing cone required. The quoted product by competitor is with injection port which may cause serious health issue in pediatric cannulation. IV cannula 24 G with injection port is normally discouraged by health professional as it produce vertical pressure to the vein as veins of pediatrics and neonates are delicate and sensitive therefore, cannot bear the pressure and may create severe problems during cannulation. It has requested to re-evaluate the competitor product according to specification.</p>	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Rehan and Mr. Aftab appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents:</p> <p>i. Undertaking regarding blacklisting/debarred legalized and notarized on stamp paper.</p> <p>ii. Undertaking regarding spurious/adulterated notarized. Therefore, the grievance of the firm is accepted. The firm got qualifying marks but status of quoted item of firm is declared as "Non-responsive" upon the grievance of M/s Lab Link Enterprises as the quoted item of M/s B Braun does not comply with advertised specifications i.e. integrated closing cone is not given with the cannula and hydrophobic blood stopper is attached instead of integrated closing cone .</p> <p>The committee reviewed the grievance of firm against M/s Lablink Enterprises in light of advertised specifications mentioned in revised RFP and found as per specification. Moreover, end user already recommended the product. Hence, grievance of the firm against M/s LAB link Enterprises is rejected.</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
8	50	I.V. Cannula with Integrated Closing Cone Size 24G	Lab Link Enterprises	Responsive	Typographical error in technical evaluation report	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that it offers NIPRO wing cath 24 with injection port and integrated closing cone while in evaluation report it was written as 22G. It has requested for correction of offered specifications.</p> <p>The firm also have grievance against M/s B Braun as follow: Vasofix quoted Vasofix IV cannula with injection port and integrated closing cone size 22 G.</p> <p>Vasofix with injection port is not available in Pakistan. B Braun sale and market Introcan IV cannula 24G. They also have submitted sample of Introcan 24G which was not as per tender specification as Introcan 24G is without integrated closing cone or any lock.</p> <p>For fluid & Injection administration Introcan 24G has no place for proper handling of stopper or closing cone.</p> <p>Introcan is simple indwelling catheter cannula for single or short term use instead of proper IV cannula.</p> <p>It has requested for correction of their specifications and rejection of IV cannula quoted by M/s B Braun on the basis of specifications.</p>	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Kahif and Mr. Rizwan appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee found that it was due to typographical error. Therefore, grievance of the firm is accepted as gauge of the quoted item was "Nipro Wing Cath 24 G with injection port and integrated closing cone flexible ETFE catheter radiopaque" instead of "Nipro Wing Cath 22 G with injection port and integrated closing cone flexible ETFE catheter radiopaque".</p> <p>The committee reviewed the grievance of firm against M/s B.Braun in light of advertised specifications mentioned in revised RFP and found that the quoted item of M/s B Braun does not comply with specification as integrated closing cone is not given with the cannula and hydrophobic blood stopper is attached instead of integrated closing cone.</p> <p>Hence, grievance of firm against M/s B Braun is accepted and thus status of quoted item of M/s B Braun is declared as "Non-responsive".</p>

Sr.	T.E No.	Item Name	Firm Name	Result as per Technical Evaluation Report	Remarks/Reasons of Rejection	Grievance Submitted by the Firm	Decision of the Committee
9	51	I.V. set sterilized with needle	The Searle Company Limited	Non-Responsive	Free sale certificate is not for last two years. Document for three years experience regarding quoted product not attached. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not attached.Does not obtain qualifying marks.	<p>The firm has submitted the grievance against the technical evaluation report and stated that:</p> <p>i. It has attached Free sale certificate along with technical bid but not accepted by committee so attaching again with grievance application.</p> <p>ii. It has attached document for three years experience regarding quoted product but not considered by committee.</p> <p>iii. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch not considered.</p> <p>iv. End user rejected the product on the basis of quality. Their product is approved in DHQ sahiwal and sargodha. They have attached relevant documents again for consideration.</p>	<p>Representative of the firm Mr. Ahmed Iqbal Khan appeared before the committee and briefed about the grievance. Grievance of the firm was examined and committee accepted the following documents:</p> <p>i. Free sale certificate.</p> <p>ii. Availability of product in two other countries. 2 Marks awarded instead of 1.</p> <p>iii. Bidder manufacturer relationship is more than 2 years. Hence 7 marks given instead of 5.</p> <p>iv. Invoices regarding availability of product in local market are of 2014. Hence, 15 marks given.</p> <p>v. Notarized Undertaking regarding spurious/adulterated batch also provided.</p> <p>vi. Undertaking regarding adulterated batch by DTL/NIH on judicial stamp paper was provided regarding quality of product. Hence 10 marks awarded. Total marks of the firm became 39.</p> <p>In the light of above, the grievance of the firm is accepted. Hence, the status of the quoted item of the firm is declared as "Responsive".</p>