MINUTES OF MEETING OF GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL COMMITTEE HELD ON 12-5-22 TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED FROM PHARMACEUTICAL FIRMS AGAINST DISQUALIFICATION OF THEIR FIRM / ITEM FOR THE TENDER FOR FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR SUPPLY OF MEDICINES INCLUDING MEDICAL DEVICES FOR ALL PESSI HOSPITALS AND DIRECTORATES FOR THE YEAR 2022-23

Sr. #	Name of Pharmaceutical Firm	Items Rejected / Reason of Rejection	Reservation of the Firm	Deliberation & Decision
1.	**M/s. Hamaz Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.**	Original F-6 not attached.	• It is stated that we had purchased bidding documents vide receipt No.16116 dated 23.04.2022 from your department and the same was attached in original with covering letter which was physically verified while opening of technical bids (copy attached). • You are requested to declare our firm as 'Responsive'.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that copy of F6 was attached with bidding documents of the firm so grievance committee recommended to accept the request of the firm. Furthermore, Grievance committee also recommended to evaluate each quoted product of the firm as per marking criteria of bidding documents. After evaluation of each quoted product, following items stood responsive 1. Cap. Hamazol 20mg P-0005 2. Syp. Zeetop 60ml P-0035 3. Tab. Phonac 50mg P-0195 4. Tab. Citalem 3-H 10mg P-0281 5. Syp. Xerosed 60ml P-0301 6. Tab. Xerosed 10mg P-0302 7. Inj. Foxime 1gm P-0452 8. Inj. Foxime 500mg, P-0452

				9. Tab. Nixin 500mg P-0464 10. Tab. Nixin 250mg P-0464 11. Inj. Teraxone 1gm P-0466 12. Inj. Teraxone 500mg P-0466 13. Susp. Suncef forte P-0475 14. Cap. Suncef 400mg P-0474 15. Inj. Pyracef 1gm P-0476 16. Inj. Pyracef 2gm P-0476 17. Tab. Lupin 250mg P-478
2.	**M/s. Karim Industries**	Technically rejected item No.P-0754 Absorbent Gauze 1 x 30 m as it was declared substandard in supply of 2020. Quoted Item No.P-0761 Tulle Dressing for having less marks in market experience.	• Firstly, we would like to clarify here that we have already challenge our case of substandard in NIH (National Institute of Health) for re-testing. According to law, if DTL report is challenged in NIH by company, the report of concern DTL went invalid until unless the report of NIH received. So, it should not be the part of Procurement / Tender. • Secondly, we have already attached past performance & market experiences, now we have again attached all supply orders of T.E. No.P-0761 Tulle Dressing (Copy Attached). • Our case may be reconsidered on merit and take decision on justified grounds.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that the firm has claimed in its Grievance that they have already challenged the case of "Substandard Absorbent Gauze" in NIH (National Institute of Health) for re-testing. The Grievance committee asked to PESSI Drug inspector to brief about standard Procedure about such cases. As per statement of PESSI Drug inspector "PQCB initially overviews such requests of firms for re-testing after declaration of a Product "Substandard" by any DTL of Punjab. After due procedure & Personal Hearing, PQCB decides that either the case may be forwarded to NIH for re-testing or reject the request for re-testing". The firm representative

				could not be able to provide any documentary evidence that the case is pending in NIH. The firm just applied in PQCB & all related due procedure & Personal hearing in PQCB is still pending. So, Firm claim that case is pending in NIH is not based upon current status therefore, Grievance committee recommended not to accept the request of firm so the "Substandard " quoted product is considered as Non-Responsive. • The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that the required past performance & market experiences regarding quoted " Tulle Dressing" was available in the bid and firm has also shown supporting documents. Therefore, Grievance committee recommended to accept the firm request and considered said Product as Responsive.
3.	**M/s. Brookes**	Kohinoor Pharma	The Committee declared M/s. Kohinoor Pharma as Responsive in Technical Evaluation Report (against Item # P-0745 & P-0746) where, as far as our best knowledge the good manufacturing	• The committee thoroughly examined the grievance request of M/S Brookes submitted against M/s. Kohinoor Pharma.

			practices certificate for drugs / medicines of same pharma is expired until now. The company must be evaluated on the valid eGMP certificate of Drugs / Medicines, as per the Compulsory Parameter Point No.IV in the bidding document of 2022-23 as well as it is mentioned in bidding document that "failure to comply with any compulsory parameter / knock out clauses will result in non-responsiveness of bidder for quoted item". Bidders comply with Compulsory Parameters knockout clauses will be evaluated further for Marking Criteria. Moreover, Kohinoor Pharma is not prequalified in DGHS & DHA Punjab Tenders for the financial year of 2022-23 for the said products. We request to your respected committee to re-evaluate this technical report and re-consider Responsiveness status of M/s. Kohinoor Pharma under the technical grounds.	The committee scrutinized the Technical bid of M/S Kohinoor Pharma & found that the firm has submitted / attached valid GMP (Good Manufacturing Certificate" issued by the competent authority i.e. DRAP (Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan). Therefore, the claim of M/S Brookes was baseless & false. Moreover, M/S Brookes also claimed that M/S Kohinoor Pharma is not prequalified in DGHS & DHA Punjab Tenders for the financial year of 2022-23 for the said products. The grievance committee discussed and highlighted that no any such Pre-qualification requirement was compulsory and not demanded from any firm in bidding Documents. Hence, Grievance committee recommended not to accept the request of M/S Brookes and as a result "M/S Kohinoor remained Responsive in said item.
4.	**M/s. Wilshire**	Inj. Ceftriaxone 500mg did not published due to typo-graphical error.	• Quoted Item No.466 Ceftriaxone Sodium for both strengths 1gm and 500 mg did not published in technical evaluation report so it is request to issue also the result of said item for 500mg strength.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that M/S Wilshire offered in its bid both strengths of Ceftriaxone Sodium

			• The quoted item No.476 Inj. Cefoperazone + Salbactum for 2gm but result mentioned responsive against 1gm. Please consider our item as quoted for 2gm.	injection i.e. 500mg & 1gm but due to typographical error only 1gm was mentioned in result of Technical evaluation. So, after examination of Technical Bid of firm, the Committee recommended that approval may be accorded to include inj Ceftriaxone 500mg also & considered as Responsive. • The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that M/S Wilshire offered in its bid Inj. Cefoperazone + Salbactum 2gm but due to typographical error 1gm was mentioned in result of Technical evaluation. So, after examination of Technical Bid of firm, the Committee recommended that Cefoperazone + Salbactum 2gm shall be responsive instead of 1gm.
5.	**M/s. Ipram**	Compulsory parameter of serial No.6 is not obtained and in undertaking, the word of sub-standard is not mentioned.	• The Company was declared as "Not Qualified on Compulsory Parameter" and it is stated that we attached all the requisite documents as required in compulsory parameter of your bidding documents further if our firm is disqualified due to some wording issue which could not be printed as required by you in bidding documents, we can provide you undertaking	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and during inspection of Technical bid of firm found that there was a compulsory Requirement in Bidding documents that The firm had to submit undertaking on Judicial

			again on judicial paper. • We request you to declare us successful.	Paper that firm's No product was declared as "adulterated or Substandard or Spurious" by any DTL During last Financial Year. The firm submitted incomplete undertaking by omitting the word "Substandard". The technical member of Grievance committee briefed to other members that there is a huge difference between adulterated, Substandard and Spurious Drugs & Mostly DTLs declare Drugs as Substandard so this negligence is of critical nature & can't be overlooked. So, the grievance committee recommended not to accept the request of the firm and considered the firm as Non-Responsive.
6.	**M/s. Shaigan Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.**	No Drug Registration attached.	• The Brotin Tablet 2.5 mg (Bromocriptine Mesylate 2.5mg) (PESSI # P-0353) but our technical bid declared non-responsive in your Technical Evaluation Report with remarks that "No Registration". • In this regard, it is stated that we have attached the Drug Registration (#013975) of Brotin Tabs 2.5 mg along with Renewal at Page No.9 to 61 in our technical bid (copy attached).	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that the essential "Drug Registration Letter along with its Renewal" for "Brotin 2.5mg Tablet was provided by the firm. So, the Grievance committee recommended to accept the firm request and considered said Product as Responsive.

7.	**M/s. Glitz**	The source of raw material and experience of quality product not attached.	• Our products have been non-responsive due to some reason. Our clarification is as under: - • P-0030: Source & purchase orders attached • P-0113: Source, purchase orders & stability study attached • P-0235: Source & purchase orders attached • P-0240: Purchase orders attached • P-0242: Purchase orders attached • P-0242: Purchase orders attached • P-0247: Source, purchase orders & sample attached • P-0266: Source, stability study & production capacity attached • P-0281: Purchase orders attached • P-0338: Purchase orders attached • P-0474: Purchase orders & samples attached	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and complete Technical Bid submitted by M/S Glitz. The required documents mentioned in Grievance request was attached only for 01 Product. Moreover, the firm Representative also could not be able to prove attachment of deficient documents in his technical bid. So, the grievance committee only recommended to consider the Product with PESSI NO. P-0030 as Responsive but all remaining Products remained as Non-responsive.
8.	**M/s. The Searle Company Ltd.**	Sample of quoted said item was not provided.	• We would like to point out that all the items applied in tender are qualified but the said item P-0718 Inj. Hospicain (Bupivacaine) is being disqualified due to missing sample. • We have already submitted the required samples against the said item at the time of submission of tender. • We would request you to accept our request and considered the said item as qualified.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that the sample of said item with PESSI No. P-0718 i.e. Inj. Hospicain (Bupivacaine) was provided by the firm but was packed or mixed with other samples. The Committee physically inspected the sample in presence of all members and the Grievance committee recommended to accept the firm request and considered said Product as Responsive.

9.	**M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd.**		• The result of new PESSI # P-0882 (AD Syringe 5ml) of M/s. Silver Surgical, the batch declared standard from DTL Punjab (copy attached). • The product is not available in any chain pharmacy. The Silver Surgical is manufacturing syringes only for tenders so its market experience require evaluation and has no experience in any of major Govt. Institutions of Punjab. • According to marking criteria, clause 5 of bidding documents, valid ISO certification is required. I request you to check the authenticity of ISO and CE Certificate from relevant issuing authorities whereas we have doubts in genuity of certificates. • I request you to please reevaluate the above mentioned new PESSI # P-0882 and disqualify on providing misleading information.	• The committee thoroughly examined the Grievance request submitted by M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd against M/s. Silver Surgical. The committee examined the Report submitted by M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) regarding the 5ml Syringe Batch declared substandard from DTL Punjab & found that the Quoted 5ml Syringe by M/s. Silver Surgical is "Auto Disable" with different Brand but the DTL report was of 5ml Syringe by M/S Silver Surgical is manual syringe with different brand. So, Committee turn down this request of M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd. • The committee also examined that Technical Evaluation criteria was completely available in bidding documents and every quoted product was evaluated technically at same parameters. M/S Silver Surgical provided supporting documents regarding Product experience & market availability & same is evaluated accordingly So, Committee turn down this request of M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd against M/S

				Silver Surgical. • M/S Silver Surgical provided valid ISO Certification in Technical Bid. The firm (M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd) representatives informed that the certificate is not attested by notary public. There was no any requirement or compulsion in bidding documents regarding attestation of such certificates and same parameter was adopted for all firms and quoted products. So, Committee turn down this griveance of M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd against M/S Silver Surgical. • As per all above details, the committee recommended to not accept the request of M/s. Nisa.SF (Pvt) Ltd. against M/S Silver Surgical.
10.	**M/s. Nisa Impex (Pvt) Ltd.**		• According to bidding documents, compulsory parameter Clause-iii, the Registration Certificate of Silver Surgical (copy attached) MDMR-000127 is for Auto Disable Syringes while the new PESSI # P-0879 is only of disposable syringe. This indicates that Silver Surgical have no registration of medical devices for 1cc and insulin. • The registration of disposable syringes is categorized in medical devices while there is no exemption by Drug Regulatory Authority while Silver Surgical have no registration of their	• The committee thoroughly examined the Grievance request submitted by M/s. Nisa. Impex (Pvt) Ltd against M/s. Silver Surgical. The committee examined the Report submitted by M/s. Nisa. Impex (Pvt) regarding the 1ml Syringe and insulin and recommended to turn down this request of M/s. Nisa. impex (Pvt) Ltd. against

			product i.e. Disposable Syringes 1cc and Insulin (copy attached). • The product is not available in any chain pharmacy. The Silver Surgical is manufacturing syringes only for tenders so its market experience require evaluation and has no experience in any of major Govt. Institutions of Punjab. • According to marking criteria, clause 5 of bidding documents, valid ISO certification is required. I request you to check the authenticity of ISO and CE Certificate from relevant issuing authorities whereas we have doubts in genuity of certificates. • So I request you to reevaluate the above mentioned item and disqualify the said firm on providing misleading information.	M/s Silver Surgical • The committee also examined that Technical Evaluation criteria was completely available in bidding documents and every quoted product was evaluated technically at same parameters. M/S Silver Surgical provided supporting documents regarding Product experience & market availability & same is evaluated accordingly So, Committee turn down this request of M/s. Nisa.Impex (Pvt) Ltd against M/S Silver Surgical. • M/S Silver Surgical provided valid ISO Certification in Technical Bid. The firm (M/s. Nisa. Impex (Pvt) Ltd) representatives informed that the certificate is not attested by notary public. There was no any requirement or compulsion in bidding documents regarding attestation of such certificates and same parameter was adopted for all firms and quoted products. So, Committee turn down this griveance of M/s. Nisa.Impex (Pvt) Ltd against M/S Silver Surgical.

11	**M/s. Novo Nordisk**		• M/s. Novo Nordisk & M/s. Getz Pharma have been qualified against human insulin PESSI Item No.P-0538, P-0539 & P-0542, we would like to draw your attention on following facts: - • Human Insulin is a biological / biotherapeutic product and WHO, EMA & USFDA defines "Biological products are a diverse category of products and are generally large, complex molecules. These products may be produced through biotechnology in a living system, such as a microorganism, plant cell, or animal cell, and are often more difficult to characterize than small molecule drugs". • As per International Guidelines of WHO, EMA, USFDA and IFPMA, biological products are approved under following pathway. • Reference Products (usually known as Innovator or Originators) • Biosimilar Products (highly similar and has no clinical meaningful difference to reference product) • Interchangeable Products (biosimilar product that meets additional requirements) • Non Comparable Products (biotherapeutic medicinal products that are intended to "copy" another biotherapeutic product; have not been directly compared and analyzed against an already licensed reference biotherapeutic product (RBP); and have not been approved via a regulatory pathway that is in alignment with WHO similar Biotherapeutic Product guidelines	The committee thoroughly examined the grievance request of M/S Novo Nordisk against M/S Getz Pharma. The matter was discussed in detail and committee members made following key observations: • M/S Getz Pharma got Zero marks out of ten marks due to non-provision of supporting data about Bio-similarity studies & M/S Novo Nordisk Pharma got maximum marks regarding this aspect of Technical evaluation criteria. • Provision of Biosimilarity data was required in Technical criteria & had weight age of 10 marks but not part of Knock out criteria so, No product can be knocked out just on this basis if it gets passing marks in Technical evaluation. • As per record, M/S Getz Pharma provided free of cost samples of insulin vials to secured workers at Social Security Teaching Hospital, Multan Road Lahore to get assessment about clinical efficacy of their insulins. As a

			that ensure quality, safety, and efficacy. • The sole purpose for adaptation to such stringent criteria by reference countries is to ensure quality, safety and efficacy as the Biologicals / biotherapeutics are complex molecules doe to its large structure thus rigorous procedure and guidelines has to be followed by furnishing detailed studies pertaining to quality, non-clinical and clinical attributes of products. • Similar criteria have been adopted by DGHS, majority of districts (34) and Teaching / allied hospitals in Punjab. Noe limited to that, MCC KPK and Sindh is also following the stringent criterion where bidder has to submit biosimilar studies (mandatory parameter) of their quoted items to prove its quality, safety and efficacy. • M/s. Getz Pharma has been qualified by the technical committee of PESSI without provision of Biosimilar studies of their quoted item i.e. Insuget. The said product has been failed to comply and provide Biosimilar studies in all above mentioned institutes. Further, safety and efficacy of said product has been question mark in various expert committee reports as attached. Even the said matter was placed before Hon'ble Multan High Court as well in W.P. No.13614/2020 and Hon'ble Lahore High Court Writ Petition 7020/2020 where the judgement has categorically stressed the need of biosimilarity studies for Insulin product to ensure quality, safety and efficacy in line with	result of this activity, then Chief Consultant Physician & Head of Medicines Department, Dr. Naeem Dilawar Kazmi also submitted a report to PESSI Head Office dated 17-06-2021. The Getz Pharma manufactured Insulin was proved therapeutically & clinically effective. So, He further recommended that the abidance of bio equivalence / Biosimiliar does not require anymore. • DRAP does not ask any such data essentially for Registration of Product & accord registration to pharmaceutical firms without any such data so, we have to follow DRAP as it is more competent & stringent regulatory body of Pakistan for all types of Pharmaceuticals. Hence the committee recommended to turn down the request of firm because all products must be technically evaluated only based upon the evaluation criteria of bidding documents.

			globally accepted criteria of WHO, EMA and USFDA guidelines. • Last but not least, we would also to draw your kind attention that PESSI Institute from last many years (approx. 10 years) has been following the stringent criteria & technically disquality generic insulins in larger interest of diabetic patients, as the other qualified generic insulin product FY 2022-23, do not match in quality, efficacy, safety, shelf life age, bio similarity, EMA certification but unfortunately this time it has been overlooked thus in wake of above precedence, international guidelines and recommendations, re-evaluation is requested for insulin products so that patients can get medicines complaint with quality, safety and efficacy parameters. • In view of above, it is requested that re-evaluation may be considered in larger interest of patients, as the other qualified generic insulin product, do not match in quality, efficacy, safety, shelf life age, bio similarity.	
12	**M/s. K.M. Enterprises**		• We are requesting to you please check the past performance of Syah Impex Brand name Shifa, Silver Surgical Pvt Ltd. Brand Green. • Please re-evaluate the samples from your honorable end-user regarding the quality of IV Cannula of all sizes and Disposable Syringes.	The committee examined the grievance thoroughly and checked the past performance of Syah Impex and Silver surgical Pvt. Ltd. The M/s K.M Enterprises was not successful in providing any supporting document against both firms. Therefore the committee recommended to turn down the

				grievance of firm.
13	**M/s. Caylex Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.**	Sample was not available	• We are unable to provide sample of all quoted products in time due to death of real cousin of CEO. • It is certainly requested to consider and firm provided the samples before Grievance Committee.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and recommended that sample of firm may be accepted in favor of healthy competition between the firm, so grievance committee recommended to accept the request of the firm. Furthermore, Grievance committee also recommended to evaluate each quoted product of the firm as per marking criteria of bidding documents. After evaluation of each quoted product, following items stood responsive 1. Tab. Nobar 20mg P-0008 2. Tab. No-deris 10mg P-0281 3. Cap Azorox 500mg P-0483 4. Cap Azorox 250mg P-0483 5. Tab. Montelex 10mg P-0615 6. Susp. Azorox DS P-0512 7. Susp. Azorox 200mg/5ml P-0512 8. Tab. Cardistatin 20mg P-0111
14.	**M/s. MTI Medical (Pvt) Ltd.**	Non-submission of Purchase Order as Experience and Batch capacity record	• We are declared Non-Responsive against Technical Evaluation No.P-0005, P-0006, P-0014, P-0076, P-0079, P-0478, P-0487, P-0488, P-0490 due to non-submission of Purchase Order as	The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm through examination of complete Technical Bid submitted by M/s.

			Experience and Batch capacity record. As we have already attached the documents with the bid (copies attached). • We request your kind attention to review and accept the grievance and declare the firm Responsive	MTI Medical (Pvt) Ltd. The firm representatives were able to show or prove attachment or availability of requisite sufficient data about only Product i.e. PESSI No. P-0487. The firm also attached supply orders for some Products but The total quantities mentioned in said supply orders were far less as compared to advertised quantities so could not get maximum marks in Technical evaluation. The grievance committee verified the total marks for each quoted product after addition of marks of documents available in Technical Bid. Only Products i.e. PESSI NO. P-0487 could be able to get passing marks but all other remaining Products could not get minimum qualifying marks in Technical Evaluation. So, the committee only recommended to consider only Product with PESSI NO. 0487 as Responsive but all remaining Products remained as Non-responsive.
15.	**M/s. Saffron Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.**	Lack of experience batch history against Item No.P-0008, P-0245, P-0305, P-0827, P-0106, P-0135, P-0699 and non provision of samples against Item No.P-	• The Company declared Non-Responsive against Item No.P-0008, P-0245, P-0305, P-0827, P-0106, P-0135, P-0699 due to lack of experience batch history and against Item No.P-106, P-	The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and complete Technical Bid submitted by M/S Saffron

		106, P-0135, P-0699	0135, P-0699 due to non provision of samples. • We would like to mention that we attached the different purchase orders in order to fulfill the experience criteria along with technical bid, but for satisfaction again attached the same. • Furthermore, our samples were supplied in two couriers, one of them was received on time but other one was received late due to which we were not able to submit the samples on time. • We humbly request you to re-evaluate and declare a responsive firm.	Pharmaceuticals. The required documents regarding Product experience & Batch history etc. were not attached din Technical Bid of the firm. The Firm Representatives also could not be able to trace the requisite and deficient documents in Submitted Technical Bid. So, the grievance committee recommended to reject the grievance of firm.
16.	**M/s. Martin Dow Marker**	Due to typographic error	• We have quoted Piroxicam 20mg Tab. /Cap. is P-0197 but you evaluated us and declare responsive Piroxicam 10mg Tab. /Cap. that we didn't even quote. • We would like to request you as this error is from your end kindly rectify this error and evaluate against said item and declare responsive.	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and found that M/S Martin Dow Marker offered in its Technical bid Piroxicam 20mg Tab. /Cap. With PESSI No. P-0197 but due to typographical error 10mg was mentioned in result of Technical evaluation. So, after examination of Technical Bid of firm Committee recommended that approval may be accorded to consider it as Piroxicam 20mg instead of 10mg.
17.	**M/s. Moringa Pharmaceuticals**	Sr. No. 245, experience not attached. less technical staff information.	• We came to know that our quoted products are qualified in compulsory criteria Non Responsive in marking criteria. • Sr.No.245 (P-0245): We have attached our market experience, sale summaries, invoices and supply orders along with our technical	• The committee thoroughly examined the request of the firm and examination of complete Technical Bid submitted by Moringa Pharmaceuticals. The firm

			proposal. According to our sale of above quoted item is above 100% of advertised quantity so give 20 marks in experience. We have already attached our technical proposal but department gave 2 marks instead of 5 marks. Please review and consider it and include the missing number in technically evaluation and give 70 marks instead of 47 marks.	representative was offered opportunity to show or prove attachment or availability of requisite Technical Staff list in its submitted Technical Bid. So, the marks of said list were added in evaluation of quoted Products of this firm. The firm attached in Technical Bid a simple list of sales summary of quoted Products generated by its own system. No supply orders were attached or provided that were issued with signatures by competent authorities of Public & Private sector so the data was not verifiable. Some invoices were also attached for some quoted products. The grievance committee members verified the total marks for each quoted product after addition of marks of documents available in Technical Bid. Only 02 Products i.e. PESSI NO. P-0432 & P-0493 could be able to get passing marks but all other remaining Products could not get minimum qualifying marks in Technical Evaluation. So, the committee only recommended
		Less market experience and less technical staff information.	• Sr.No.432 (P-0432): We have attached our market experience, sale summaries, invoices and supply orders along with our technical proposal. According to our sale of above quoted item is above 100% of advertised quantity so give 20 marks in experience. We have already attached our technical proposal but department gave 2 marks instead of 5 marks. Please review and consider it and include the missing number in technically evaluation and give 70 marks instead of 57 marks.	
		Less market experience and less technical staff information.	• Sr.No.493 (P-0493): We have attached our market experience, sale summaries, invoices and supply orders along with our technical proposal. According to our sale of above quoted item is above 100% of advertised quantity so give 20 marks in experience. We have already attached our technical proposal but department gave 2 marks instead of 5 marks. Please review and consider it and include the missing number in technically evaluation and give 70 marks instead of 57 marks.	
		No market experience and less technical staff information.	• Sr.No.512 (P-0512): We have attached our market experience, sale summaries, invoices	

			and supply orders along with our technical proposal. According to our sale of above quoted item is above 100% of advertised quantity so give 20 marks in experience. We have already attached our technical proposal but department gave 2 marks instead of 5 marks. Please review and consider it and include the missing number in technically evaluation and give 70 marks instead of 47 marks.	considering 02 Product with PESSI NO. 0432 & P-0493 as Responsive but all remaining Products remained as Non-responsive.