



Subject: **MINUTES OF MEETING GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE FOR THE REDRESSAL OF GRIEVANCES OF APPLICANTS AGAINST THE TENDER FOR FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF JANITORIAL CONSUMABLES & OTHER ITEMS BID REFERENCE**

Meeting of Grievance Redressal Committee was held on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 2:00 pm in the Committee Room of Project Management Unit (PMU), 31-E1, Gulberg III, Shahrah-e-Imam Hussain, Lahore under the convener ship of Project Director, PMU. The attendance of the subject meeting is attached at **Annex-A**.

2. Project Management Unit Primary & Secondary Healthcare Department invited sealed proposals (Technical & Financial) against the advertised tender IPL No.354 named “**FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR PROCUREMENT OF JANITORIAL CONSUMABLES & OTHER ITEMS**”, Bid Reference No: *P&SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021*. Consequently, 19 applicants submitted their proposals for the subject tender which were received and opened on 03-02-2021. Notified Procurement Committee evaluated the Technical Proposals in accordance with Rule No. 32 of Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014. As per Technical Proposal Evaluation Report, out of 19 applicants only 09 firms were declared Technically Responsive according to their submitted profile. The Technical Proposals Evaluation Report was uploaded on official website of PMU & P&SHD and was informed through email to all the applicants. The signed Technical Proposals Evaluation Report is attached at **Annex-B**.

3. Foregoing in view, Project Management Unit (PMU) received the grievances from the applicants against the Technical Proposal Evaluation Report of the subject tender. The grievances of the applicants are attached at **Annex-C**. In accordance with Rule-67 of PPR-2014 the Grievance Committee after examination of grievances, scrutiny of record, hearing the representative of each aggrieved applicant / firm and due deliberation and discussion, decided upon the grievances of the bidders. The detail of the grievances, deliberations & decisions of Grievance Redressal Committee is given below.

Sr. No.	Name of Aggrieved Applicant	Grievances
1	Colgate Palmolive Pvt. Ltd	<p><b>1. <u>Subject: - GRIEVANCE - ZR-ENGINEERING - Tender No. P&amp;SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021</u></b></p> <p>In reference to the above captioned tender number, your department has published a technical evaluation results on 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2021 &amp; in this phase, your technical team has approved the surface cleaner samples of M/s. ZR Engineering. In this regard, I have few observations which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please share the name of ZR engineering surface cleaning product</li> <li>• Is it a renowned brand &amp; easily available in market</li> <li>• Does ZR Engineering has his own facility of production</li> <li>• Availability on how many outlets nationally (Retail Presence?)</li> <li>• Annual turnover of surface cleaning product in volume &amp; value</li> </ul> <p>I would request you to please review your technical decision about the product (Surface cleaner) of this vendor because P&amp;SHD / PMU always preferred such brands which have a strong retail presence.</p> <hr/> <p><b>2. <u>Subject: - GRIEVANCE - Tender No. P&amp;SHD/PMU/PMP/I001 &gt;2020-2021</u></b></p> <p>In reference to the above captioned tender number, your department has published a technical evaluation on 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2021. In this phase, your technical team has rejected our product (MAX Surface CLEANER - 1000ml) narrating that <b><u>"SAMPLE DOES NOT CONFORM THE SPECIFICATIONS"</u></b>. In this regard, I would request you to please consider our letters which were shared with your team on dated 19<sup>th</sup> Feb, 2021 about the MAX APC Item Composition / Ingredients &amp; Chloroxlyenol or Equivalent as an active ingredient subjects. (Both letters attached)</p> <p>I assure you that our product meets the mentioned specifications i.e:"Chloroxlyenol or Equivalent as an active ingredient" (Detailed formulation literature attached)</p> <p>Our objective to participate in this tender is to provide high-quality hygiene items / environment to all Government hospitals of Punjab by partnering with P&amp;SHD / PMU at very special prices keeping the noble cause in the consideration.</p> <p>I would request you to please review your decision &amp; pass our sample for the next phase. Looking forward to your kind consideration</p>
	<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>	<p>The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm, discussed in the presence of M/s ZR Engineering's representative who answered all the queries in satisfactory manner. The committee was informed that the name of Surface Liquid Clear is "Roxinol" which is a renowned brand having DRAP No.014883, easily available in selected merchandizes and its turnover was also briefed by M/s ZR Eng. From its technical proposal. Refer to the second subject matter, the aggrieved party was given ample time to submit any concrete document / vouch able independent regulatory body reports to prove the matter but it couldn't prove its stance regarding the</p>

		composition of Chloroxvlenol as an active ingredient as required by the committee. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.
2	<b>Reckitt Benckiser Pakistan Limited</b>	<p align="center"><b><u>GRIEVANCE AGAINST EVALUATION REPORT OF INSECT KILLER &amp; HAND WASH CONSUMABLES</u></b></p> <p><b><u>INSECT KILLER SPRAY -10</u></b>  Technical Specification of tender are Permethrin and imiprothrin as an active ingredient or equivalent combination having at least permetherin. Our quoted product complies with required technical specification combination. Whereas the tendered product of firm G MED does not contain imiprothrin. Further, the tendered product of G MED contains higher concentration of D-Allethrin &amp; Permethrin which is health hazardous. The objective of the product usage is eradication of insects with minimum toxicity/ damage to environment. G MED product does not comply with health standards.  Manufacturer and their authorized are eligible bidders. G MED is not manufacturer nor authorized distributor of manufacturer. If it is so that should be verified from manufacturer.  As per clause vii of the evaluation criterion, the firm who has participated in tender does not have experience of 5 projects in public and private sector. This firm is first time participating with this product.</p> <p><b><u>HAND WASH LIQUID-08</u></b>  Colgate - Palmolive Pakistan has quoted inferior brand against Hand Wash Liquid. The quoted brand does not specify the site and place of manufacturing. Same firm has also marketing its brand Protex and did not quote in the tender. Both brands do not indicate manufacturing sites. Only complaint management contact number has been specified. This indicates that firm is manufacturing these products from third party by modification of formulas and protocols. Further, financial bids of the firm were packed in same package which is against the procurement rules. Similarly, manufacturers of ZR Engineering have also manufacturing multiple brands at one place. These firms does not comply international standards and formulating/ modify their products as per need of customer which is against ethics and international product standards.  It is requested to kindly technically disqualify the firms for Insect killer and hand wash liquid.  Thanking You, Your faithfully.</p>
	<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>	The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm, discussed in the presence of M/s GMED firm's representative who satisfactorily answered all the queries. Refer to the second subject matter, the aggrieved party's concerns were heard in the presence of the other firms i.e; M/s Colgate Palmolive Pakistan & M/s ZR Engineering, both had addressed the queries in satisfactory manner to M/s Reckitt Benckiser. Further M/s Reckit Benckiser couldn't prove its stance regarding the manufacturing plants of other parties as required by the committee. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.

3	Greenz International	<p><b>1. Subject:- <u>Grievance against Tender of Janitorial Consumables</u></b></p> <p>We would like to draw to your kind attention towards the fact that on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2021, your esteemed department uploaded the technical evaluation report for P&amp;SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021. Our company, M/s Greenz International was deemed Non-Responsive for Normal Waste Bags, Color Coded Waste Bags and Disinfectant Hydrogen Peroxide H2O2.</p> <p>Dear Sir,</p> <p><b><u>For Normal Waste Bags &amp; Color Coded Waste Bags:</u></b></p> <p>Sir we have the distinction of being the vendor for this item for the last 2 years and our product was being delivered without any problem to the complete satisfaction of PMU and of the end user. Backed by the fact that we have not received a single complaint whatsoever.</p> <p>The quality of our supplies in the previous two years were checked by the inspection committee and the well renowned testing facility SGS, and was passed with flying colors.</p> <p>However, according to the technical evaluation report, our sample was deemed "Inferior Quality" for the bid mentioned in the subject. What makes this decision even more baffling is that the samples we submitted on 18-02-2021 were the left-over waste bags from our previous supply.</p> <p>We would like to request your honor to please reconsider your decision keeping in view the above facts and approve our samples.</p> <p><b><u>For Disinfectant Hydrogen Peroxide H2O2:</u></b></p> <p>The technical evaluation committee deemed us non-responsive, stating that the "sample was rejected due to non-availability of DRAP Registration". We would like to bring to your kind attention that Wilshire Laboratories is one of the biggest pharmaceutical manufacturers in Pakistan and has over 200 products registered under DRAP. Our product Savidro+ is a surface disinfectant, not a medical device nor a drug, due to which this product does not fall in DRAP's domain. Due to this fact our product is not registered by DRAP. Presently the market leaders in Surface Disinfectants are Descon's Sanidol and Sitara Chemicals Sitara Safe Disinfectant; even they aren't registered with DRAP either. We would urge your honor to please confirm this fact from DRAP as well.</p> <p>As DRAP themselves have pointed out that this product cannot be registered we would request your honor to pass our sample.</p> <p>We would also like to point out that the only company who was passed Z.R Engineering, the product they submitted to PMU namely PEROXYDOL- TM is not a surface disinfectant. If you carefully see its bottle you will see that it says "useful as a cleansing agent for minor cuts, abrasions of the skin". Considering this product is to be used on human skin for medical purposes this does fall under DRAP's domain. However, we are fairly certain that even this product does not have valid DRAP registration as the registration number on the bottle is 004708 which means it was registered a few decades ago before the inception of DRAP in 2011-2012.</p> <p>As Peroxydol can only be used on human skin for disinfection and cannot be used for the surface disinfection purposes, we would request your honor to please reconsider your decision keeping in view the above-mentioned</p>
---	----------------------	--

		facts and reject this sample.
	<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>	<p>The grievance redressal committee was informed that M/s Greenz International had submitted two letter to the office of Chief Secretary Punjab &amp; Secretary P&amp;SHD regarding the evaluation of waste bags, in response to that a detailed report was prepared for Secretary P&amp;SHD and submitted to Chief Secretary Punjab Office explaining all the matters in satisfactory manner. Additionally M/s Greenz Int. raised a point related singular ownership of M/s GMED &amp; M/s Carevell Pvt. Ltd. however the aggrieved firm couldn't present any evidence regarding the cited allegation rather time wasting effort of the honorable committee.</p> <p>Refer to the submitted grievance regarding Waste Bags , grievance redressal committee evaluated all the samples and thoroughly review the grievances. It is pertinent to mention that M/s Greenz International later on submitted a request letter Subject: Tender No. P&amp;SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021 Dated 19-03-2021 (Annexed), requesting to withdraw the original grievance letter, duly admitting the inability to comply with the potential work order (if awarded) due to paucity of time. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected as withdrawn and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.</p> <p>Refer to the second query regarding H2O2, M/s Greenz International failed to prove its stance regarding its own offered product i.e: Sanidol. However refer to the second part of the H2O2 formulation of M/s ZR Engineering offered product and its updated DRAP registration, M/s ZR Engineering was failed to prove its stance of updated / current registration from any documentary evidence.</p> <p>Hence the grievance of the firm is rejected as withdrawn and the technical evaluation report of the committee shall prevail.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>G-MED</b>	<p><b><u>SUBJECT: GREVANCE REGARDING THE INVITATION FOR BIDS FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF JANITORIAL CONSUMABLES &amp; OTHER ITEMS FOR FINANCIAL YEAR 2020-21</u></b></p> <p>Reference to the subject mentioned above, We want to submit our grievance against the firm M/S Greenz International as follows.</p> <p><b>Audited Financial statements (last 03x year)</b></p> <p>As per technical evaluation criteria, audited financial statements of last 3 years were demanded However as per our information M/s Greens International did not submit the Audited financial statement for the financial year 2019-2020. According to evaluation uploaded they have only been rejected on the basis of sample where as they should also be technically rejected on the basis of non- compliance of required documents. After submission of bids, procuring agency cannot accept any additional documents and our claim is further validated with reference to the PPRA Rules 2014 clause <b>33. Clarification of bids.</b> -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.No bidder shall be allowed to alter or modify his bid after the closing time for the submission of the bids.</li> <li>2.The procuring agency may, if necessary, after the opening of the bids, seek and accept such clarifications of the bid as do not change the substance of the bid.</li> </ol> <p>Above mentioned are our submissions against the respective technical evaluation report. It is requested to please accept our grievance and reject the said firm on the above explained rules. We will be grateful to you in these regards.</p>

	<p align="center"><b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b></p>	<p>The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm, discussed in the presence of M/s Greenz International's representative, it was briefed that the minimum turnover clause is already fulfilled by the submitted annual financial statement, in addition to that M/s GMED couldn't furnish the documentary evidence. Refer to the second subject matter, the aggrieved party couldn't prove its stance regarding the composition of the cited product as required by the committee. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.</p>																								
<p align="center">5</p>	<p align="center"><b>Siddiqui &amp; Brothers Chemicals</b></p>	<p><b><u>SUB: GRIEVANCE LETTER</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Liquid Toilet Cleaner 1000 ML</b></li> <li>2. <b>Hand Wash Liquid 1000 ML</b></li> <li>3. <b>Surface Liquid Cleaner</b></li> <li>4. <b>Disinfectant Hydrogen Peroxide H2O2</b></li> <li>5. <b>Insect Killer</b></li> </ol> <p>Dear Sir,  In review of your evaluation report regarding the subject matter, are happy to submit our replies to your highlighted objections.  We are submitting herewith, our Company's Audit Report for the past three years. At this stage it is important to brought some statistical errors into your kind notice and request to please RE-CONSIDER objected points raised by you.  1) Related to Sr. No 10. The average business value of our company @ Rs. 32,017,349/- has been taken while in actual it is Rs. 36,889,036/-. It also shows that the annual turnover of our company is above from your requirements, Details as follows.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 850 1744 1166"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th align="center">YEAR</th> <th align="center" colspan="2">TURN OVER</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">1.</td> <td align="center">2018</td> <td align="center">Rs.</td> <td align="right">32,923,185/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">2.</td> <td align="center">2019</td> <td align="center">Rs.</td> <td align="right">36,643,834/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">3.</td> <td align="center">2020</td> <td align="center">Rs.</td> <td align="right">41,100,091/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center">TOTAL TURNOVER:</td> <td align="center">Rs.</td> <td align="right">110,667,110/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center">AVERAGE TURN OVER PER YEAR:</td> <td align="center">Rs.</td> <td align="right">36,889,036/-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>) According to Sr. No. 11, a code N/A mentioned while "Certificate of Analysis of consumable items" has already been attached with the technical proposal of tender documents (Copy Attached for Reference).  ) Furthermore, in Serial Number 13 (Technical Specification and Sample) has been submitted as per technical specification according to your requirement.  We do hope that above clarification will meet your required level of Business and we will be happy to assist you for any further queries.</p>		YEAR	TURN OVER		1.	2018	Rs.	32,923,185/-	2.	2019	Rs.	36,643,834/-	3.	2020	Rs.	41,100,091/-		TOTAL TURNOVER:	Rs.	110,667,110/-		AVERAGE TURN OVER PER YEAR:	Rs.	36,889,036/-
	YEAR	TURN OVER																								
1.	2018	Rs.	32,923,185/-																							
2.	2019	Rs.	36,643,834/-																							
3.	2020	Rs.	41,100,091/-																							
	TOTAL TURNOVER:	Rs.	110,667,110/-																							
	AVERAGE TURN OVER PER YEAR:	Rs.	36,889,036/-																							

		We are looking forward to have a positive and healthy business relationship.
	<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>	The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm and thoroughly review the submitted technical profile of the firm, apart from the plea raised by the firm, the committee had observed that the financial statements submitted by the respective firm are dubious as general and appears to be grave nature. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.
6	AI Wali Care Concepts	<p><b>1. Subject: <u>letter For Re-Evaluation(grievance)</u></b>  With reference Tender P&amp;SHD/PMU/PMP/ (001)/2020-2021 dated 03-2-2021, I am writing to file grievance for rejection on behalf of Al-Waali Care. We were rejected because we didn't meet the minimum score requirement in technical evaluation. I wanted to inform that we attached all the documents with technical proposal and after that on call discussion we submit all documents by hand.  Documents as follow</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authority Letter by company and manufacture</li> <li>2. Bank Certificate 2020</li> <li>3. References</li> <li>4. Certificate for analysis</li> </ol> <p><b>2. Ref: <u>Tender for the Purchase of Janitorial consumables</u></b>  Dear Sir,  This is in reference to your above mentioned tender and evaluation report.  Kindly note as follows:  1.We had quoted for (tender Item Number 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,11) as per your requirement mentioned in the tender inquiry, we had already submit all Technical documents in bid .  2. Furthermore On call Discussion we submit again all the relevant documents ask by Authority.  3. With this letter again i submitting the documents for technical evaluation  4. Samples also submit on time  We request you to please re-evaluate our company  We assure you the best services if we remain  Due to above fact we request you to please re-consider your evaluation accordingly</p>
	<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>	The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm, the aggrieved party couldn't prove its stance regarding the composition of the cited product as required by the committee. Hence, the grievances of the firm is rejected and the technical report of the evaluation committee shall prevail.
7	ZR ENGINEERING	<b>1. Subject: <u>GRIEVANCE AGAINST TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF JANITORIAL CONSUMABLES &amp; OTHER ITEMS.</u></b>

ITEM# 08. HAND WASH LIQUID, Tender:  
P&SHD/PMU/PMP/(001 )2020-2021  
Respected Sir.

This letter of Grievance is with reference to Technical Evaluation Report of framework contract for the procurement of janitorial consumables & other items. Item #08, HAND WASH LIQUID, Tender: P&SHD/PMU/ PMP/ (001) 2020-2021.

Sir, our sample has been declared non responsive on the basis of Inferior Quality The word quality means contents/ ingredients/ formulation of the product. The observation is vague and does not specify any deviation from advertised technical specification (Product is fully complying with specifications and same can be tested from an independent laboratory for corroboration of quality. A product can be rejected after identifying technical issues in products. Further our manufacturing facility is fully equipped for manufacturing quality products Our plant is duly approved by DRAP and we have GMP& ISO certifications as well You may visit our manufacturing facility at any time to check our production quality which meets any other product of multinational standards.

We have also attached product Certificate of Analysis and lab reports with the bidding document. The documents duly qualify our product for its standards and quality. You may send our product to any qualified lab and check its quality.

You are therefore, requested to kindly reconsider your decision and qualify our product for a healthy competition.

---

**2. Subject: GRIEVANCE AGAINST TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF JANITORIAL CONSUMABLES & OTHER ITEMS.**

ITEM#15Spray Pump,Tender:P&SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021

Respected Sir,

This letter of Grievance is with reference to Technical Evaluation Report of framework contract for the procurement of janitorial consumables & other items. Item #15 Spray Pump, Tender :P&SHD/PMU/PMP/(001)2020-2021.

Our humble submission is that below mentioned points may kindly be considered before technically qualifying any Bidder or their quoted product. The points are part of Knock Down Evaluation Criteria and Product Specifications in the Bidding Document

**1.WHO Recommended Specifications/ Approved Standard:**

Required Quality Standard for the Spray Pumps as per bidding document was“As **per WHO recommended specifications/ Approved Standard**”. Any sample that do not meet the required specifications must be declared non-responsive. For the purpose, the firm either can provide any certification for imported products or report from some Government organization. The only government qualified institution that can test and verify the required standards in Pakistan is Agricultural Mechanization Research Institute (AMRI) Multan. We have duly attached the

report of our quoted Spray Machine with technical bid. The report has comprehensively compared our machine with the WHO standards and found that our machine duly meets the WHO Standards which are same as specified in your bidding document. However, as per our information the other spray pump with the name of DADA Spray Pump qualified in your technical evaluation do not meet the WHO standards and never been approved by AMRI as having no certification/ report. The spray pump is of inferior quality and made specifically for Agriculture requirements. This spray pump does not meet the other specification mentioned in your bidding document and WHO recommendations

**2. Relevant Experience in both Public & Private sectors:**

As per our information the firm M/s G MED has no experience of supplying the quoted spray pumps in any major government institution in Pakistan **Hence, the prospective firm does not meet the criteria and no data is available for quoted product supply of 5 Projects.** Further, manufacturer of the said spray pump has any history of supplying the quoted spray pump to any major government institution in Pakistan. Their record may kindly be checked & verified However, we have been supplying the quoted spray pumps to various government instruction including Health Department Punjab, DGHS, Punjab, DGHS, KPK, District Health Office, Lahore and various District Health Offices in Punjab. All relevant Supply Orders are duly attached with the bidding documents.

**3. Verification of Specifications as per Bidding Documents & WHO recommendations :**

Below are the few WHO guidelines for equipment for vector control Specification. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2010.9. The have mentioned below few guidelines for equipment for vector control that needs to be followed.

Recommendations by World Health Organization 2010 WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2010.9

EQUIPMENT FOR VECTOR CONTROL SPECIFICATION GUIDELINES

**2.3 Materials of construction:**

To have a machine that is constructed with materials that are resistant to corrosion and chemical formulations and will not deteriorate with normal usage and affect normal operation of the equipment.

**2.10.3 Lance :**The lance shall be straight and of a minimum length of **500 mm so** mat spray is released away from the operator's body.

**2.10.5 Nozzle**

**2.10.5.1 Flow rate :**To check that the output of a nozzle is correct.

**2.10.5.3 Erosion resistance :**To ensure that the output of the nozzle will not increase due to rapid erosion of its orifice.

**2.12 Straps and fastenings :**To ensure strap durability and enable a machine to be carried comfortably and safely by the operator.

Requirements

a) The width of the strap shall be sufficient to avoid discomfort when positioned on the operator's shoulder and shall be 50 mm + 5 mm. The strap shall be of adjustable length.

		You are therefore, requested to kindly check and verify the above mentioned observations and reject the M/s G MED as does not comply with the above mentioned parameters.
<b>Deliberation &amp; Decision of the Grievance Redressal Committee</b>		The Grievance Redressal Committee heard the stance pleaded by the firm, the aggrieved party proven its stance in satisfactory manner and its sample was re-evaluated by the committee and found its according to conformed advertised requirements/ specification. Hence, the Grievance of M/s ZR Engineering is accepted regarding acceptance of Hand Wash Liquid and the Revised Technical Proposal Evaluation Report is attached at <b>Annex</b> . Refer to the second part of grievance related to Spray Pumps against M/s GMED Pvt. Ltd. , the aggrieved firm stance was heard in the presence of M/s GMed Pvt. Ltd, however the other firm i.e; M/s GMED Pvt. Ltd. failed to satisfactory answer the queries backed with concrete vouch able evidence. Hence, the Grievance of M/s ZR Engineering is accepted regarding acceptance of Spray Pumps and M/s GMED Spray Pumps stands rejected by the committee. The Revised Technical Proposal Evaluation Report is attached at <b>Annex</b> .

3. The committee unanimously agreed the decisions in response to the grievances received and meeting is ended to and with thanks to the chair.

**Legal Expert**  
Procurement Cell, P&SHD

**Assistant Director (A&A)**  
Development Wing, P&SHD

**Director ICT**  
PMU, P&SHD

**Director (F&A)**  
PMU, P&SHD

**Director (Headquarter)**  
PMU, P&SHD

**Additional Secretary (Technical)**  
PMU, P&SHD

**Project Director**  
PMU, P&SHD