**MINUTES OF THE 21st MEETING OF KMU TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 23/11/2021**

 The meeting of KMU Technical Evaluation Committee was held on 23/11/2021 at 11:30 AM, in committee room of Khyber Medical University, to address the grievances and appeals of the participant firms and conclude matter accordingly. It merits attention that in case of any change/alteration it should be become part of previous report issued on 11/11/2021 those previously issued minutes will be revised/updated accordingly. The following attended the meeting:

1. Dr. Sami Siraj, Associate Professor, IBMS Chairman
2. Mr. Usman Iqbal, Deputy Treasurer, KMU Member
3. Mr. Ihsan Javed, System Analyst, KMU Member
4. Mr. Sajid Aziz, Lab Technologist, KMU Member/Secretary
5. Dr. Yasir Mehmood Yousafzai, Director, PHRL End User / Technical Expert
6. Dr. Ishaq N Khan, Assistant Professor IBMS Co-opted Member

 The Chair welcomed the participants and initiated meeting with formal proceedings. The Deputy Director (Procurement) facilitated the forum by providing all relevant documents associated with agenda item.

**AGENDA NO.1 PERSONAL HEARING OF APPLICATIONS/GRIEVANCES BY THE VENDORS AGAINST REPORT OF 20TH MEETING OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE HELD ON 11/11/2021**

Four companies submitted applications for re-evaluation of their bids. Their bids were re-evaluated with technical expert’s. Following are the minutes

|  | **Vendor** | **Nature of complaint** | **Decision** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scientific Supplies | 1. Bids were declared nonresponsive due to unmatched specifications.
2. Marks to be revised
 | 1. Detailed Specifications provided by the firm were re-evaluated by technical experts. Technical experts apprised the committee that the same kit/s have been tested on their systems and were found to be satisfactory. Based on recommendation by the technical expert, M/S Scientific Supplies was deemed responsive in criteria 2.1 (Specification).
2. Submitted satisfactory reports were evaluated by the committee and were given 4 marks after recommendation by the technical experts
 |
|  | Global Marketing Services | 1. Bids were declared nonresponsive due to unmatched specifications
2. Documents were submitted but marks not given
 | 1. Detailed Specifications were provided by the firm and therefore were considered in the presence of technical experts. The technical experts reviewed the specifications in detail and found them as per requirement. Furthermore, the committee was also appraised that the same product of the said firm is in use of KMU PHRL.
2. Specifications were reconsidered. The committee awarded 10 marks in criteria 2.1.
3. Other documents/certificates were not considered by the committee as those were not technical in nature and has to be provided with bidding documents at first stage.
 |
|  | Sahaab International | 1. Reason for assigning nonresponsive
2. Automated extraction and amplification kit were non responsive
 | 1. The appeal was discussed by committee in detail. However, after though deliberation the decision of sub committee has been kept unchanged and bids remained non responsive.
 |
|  | SU Enterprises | Marks are unsatisfactory/less | On request of the technical committee reconsidered reevaluated the bid. The new fresh documents provided by the firm were also considered and following decisions were made.1. Maximum marks already awarded under criteria 5.1
2. While documents provided against criteria 5.2 were not in acceptable format i.e., those were not on official latter heads instead were on plain white papers.
 |