

MINUTES OF GRIEVANCE MEETING RELATED TO TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE PURCHASE OF ELECTRO MEDICAL EQUIPMENT FOR PESSI HOSPITALS YEAR 2020-21

The meeting of grievance redressal committee related to grievances of firms regarding the Technical Evaluation Report for the purchase of Electro Medical Equipment for PESSI Hospital Year 2020-21 was held on 08.06.2021 under the chairmanship of Director (C&B) comprising of following members: -

1. Director (Audit), PESSI, Head Office, Lahore Member
2. Medical Superintendents, MNCH, KLP, Lahore Co-Opt Member

The committee was apprised that the Technical Evaluation Committee for the purchase of Electro-Medical Equipment evaluated the bids of firms. The Technical Evaluation Report was declared on 24.05.2021.

Total 14-firms which submitted representations/grievances against the Technical Evaluation Report and other firms are enlisted below,

Sr. #	Name of firm
1	M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD.
2	M/S SHIRAZI TRADING COMPANY (PVT) LTD.
3	M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC
4	M/S G-Med (PVT) LTD
5	M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD
6	M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY
7	M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS
8	M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE
9	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES
10	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE
11	M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS
Representations/Grievances against other firms	
1	M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD.
2	M/S TOTAL TECHNOLOGIES (PVT) LTD
3	M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD
4	M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY
5	M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS
6	M/S JAMSUNG
7	M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE
8	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES
9	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE
10	M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS

The detail of representations/grievances against the rejection of bids/items is as under -:

Sr .#	Name of Firm	Item #	Name of Item	Technical Evaluation Committee Observation	Grievance/Clarification of Firm	Decision of the Grievances Committee
1	M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD.	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Product does not have minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally. 2. Tidal volume is from 20 to 1500 ml instead of 5-1400 ml. 3. Monitor is not of the same manufacturer. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our product has more than 2 years past performance history in Pakistan. Copy of POs and after sale certificates are attached. 2. We confirm that the tidal volume of our quoted model in pressure control ventilation mode is from 5 -1400 ml (copy of manufacturer declaration is attached) 3. We have already mentioned in our technical bid that Monitor shall be provided by the same manufacturer will be compatible with the Anesthesia Machine and Ventilator. Manufacturer confirmation is attached. 	<p>Mr. Khawaja Naveed represented M/S Radiant Medical (PVT) LTD. and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm with respect to their bid could not clarify that their product has minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally, hence committee rejected the grievance of firm. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that their quoted model has tidal volume from 5-1400 ml in pressure control ventilation mode. Upon the recommendation of end user, the committee accepted the grievance. 3. There was no certificate attached which indicated that the manufacturer of Anesthesia Machine has any kind of contract with the manufacturer of the Patient monitor hence the grievance of the firm was rejected. <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S Radiant Medical (PVT) Ltd will remain NON-RESPONSIVE</p>

2	M/S SHIRAZI TRADING COMPANY (PVT) LTD.	01, 05, 06	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR, Ventilator Peads, Ventilator ICU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AUTHORIZATION EXPIRED ON 30 APRIL 2021 2. The Manufacturer should have documentary evidence to the effect that they are the original Manufacturer of the quoted product with indication of manufacturing site and its location. 3. Performance of the firm with PESSI regarding supply of equipment fully compliant with the ordered specifications (if supply order was awarded in past) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are authorized distributor of GE Healthcare, USA since 2012. We have submitted the letter of authorization having validity till 29th April 2021 which gets renewed every year. Moreover, we have enclosed the extended letter of Authorization issued by GE Healthcare, USA for further processing of the tender. 2. GE Healthcare is the original equipment manufacturer of the quoted products. It has its own manufacturing facility for Anesthesia Machine Model: 9100c NXT and patient monitor model: B125 in China. Moreover, for Peads Ventilator & ICU Ventilators model: Carecape R860 GE Healthcare, USA has its own manufacturing facility in USA. (Documentary Evidence from the manufacturer is attached). 3. We have supplied Anesthesia Machines (Qty. 02) against supply order No.SSP(679)/2016/(MNCH)/563 dated 30.06.2016 issued by "The Punjab Employee's Social Security Institution Head Office, Lahore." Our installed Anesthesia Machines are in good condition and we have been providing the satisfactory back-up services. (Copy attached) 	<p>Mr. Dawood Siraj represented M/S SHIRAZI TRADING COMPANY (PVT) LTD. and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm submitted the extended letter of Authorization issued by GE Healthcare, USA. 2. The representative of the firm clarified the objection that GE Healthcare is the original manufacturer of the quoted products. 3. The committee observed that as it was not necessarily required that the firm should have past experience with PESSI, so accepted the grievance of the firm. <p>Decision:</p> <p>After all the clarifications of the firm, the committee decided to accept the grievance of the firm.</p> <p>Hence M/S SHIRAZI TRADING COMPANY (PVT) LTD is RESPONSIVE in Ventilator Peads and Ventilator ICU and NON-Responsive in ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR.</p>
---	--	------------	--	--	---	---

		01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tidal Volume is from 20 to 1500 ml instead of 5-1400 ml. 2. No FDA Certificate 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With reference to the tender specifications “Tidal Volume from 5 to 1400ml” is required. And we have offered the tidal volume starting from 5ml to 1500ml in pressure control mode and 20-1500ml in volume control mode. (Brochure and User Manual attached). Our quoted model: 9100c NXT of Anesthesia Machine is fully capable to deliver the required tidal volume to meet the clinical applications of the device. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The firm told the committee that their quoted model has tidal volume from 5-1400 ml in pressure control ventilation mode. Upon the recommendation of end user, the committee accepted the grievance. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that their product had no FDA quality certificate but CE and MHLW. The committee observed that as the country of Manufacturer was USA hence it was mandatory for the product to have FDA quality certificate. <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S SHIRAZI TRADING COMPANY (PVT) LTD. will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
3	M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC	05 & 06	VENTILATOR PEADS & VENTILATOR ICU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the technical evaluation report, we are non-responsive due to submission of bid security in shape of CDR instead of Bank Guarantee. 2. PPRA letter dated 29th July 2020, (letter attached) clearly confirms that BG, CDR and bank draft are acceptable. 3. PPRA has given relaxation to bidder that they can submit security in another format i.e. CDR. 	<p>Mr. M Noman represented M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm told the committee that they are non-responsive due to submission of bid security in shape of CDR instead of Bank Guarantee. They added that PPRA letter dated 29th July 2020, clearly confirms that BG, CDR and bank draft are acceptable. <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p>

						Hence M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC will remain NON-RESPONSIVE .
4	M/S G-Med (PVT) LTD	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	<p>1. At the time of opening of tender, it was found by the tender opening committee that the Bank Guarantee was not attached with the bid of the firm. The representative of the firm was present there and when he was inquired, he told that the Bank Guarantee was attached with the financial bid and requested that he could submit an undertaking for that but failed to provide the undertaking. Therefore, the bid opening committee decided to reject the bid of the firm.</p>	<p>1. We have submitted the tender within the due time but in technical evaluation report, the evaluation of our firm is not included. It may be overlooked by the technical evaluation committee.</p> <p>2. Further the original 5 % Bid security value of 1,240,000.00 Dated 23-04-2021 copy attached with this letter further the original will be presented in front of grievance committee, which was not attached with the financial offer of the tender due to (Covid-19) short timings of banks.</p> <p>3. As the bid security is of the same date as of the due date of tender so please accept the attached bank guarantee.</p>	<p>Mr. Zeeshan represented M/S G-Med (PVT) LTD and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The committee was apprised that the firm had not attached bank guarantee with the bid. So the bid opening committee rejected the bid of the firm.</p> <p>2. The firm presented the original Bank guarantee before the committee, which was not attached at the time of submission of bid.</p> <p>3. The firm requested as the Bank Guarantee is of the same date as of the due date of tender so please accept the bank guarantee.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>the committee observed that the firm had not attached bank guarantee with the bid before the closing date and time of the tender so it was not possible to accept the bank guarantee at this stage of tender as per PPRA rules, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Tender Opening Committee.</p> <p>Hence the bid of M/S G-Med (PVT) LTD will remain REJECTED.</p>
5	M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	<p>1. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE</p> <p>2. Tidal Volume is from 20 to 1400ml instead of 5-1400ml.</p>	<p>1. CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules (annexures are attached). Also the most common factor of submission of bid security is in shape of CDR because it is the most reliable instrument of bank and secondly, bid security</p>	<p>Mr. Sajid Ali represented M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The representative of the firm told the committee that CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules. the committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was</p>

				<p>needs to submit for short period of time with submission of bid. In case of performance bond which needs to submit by successful bidder shall be in the form of Bank Guarantee because it needs to submit for longer period of time with purchaser.</p> <p>2. We have quoted the anesthesia machine with ventilator model Fabius Plus manufactured by Dragerwerk, Germany. The capability to deliver the tidal volume of this device is as per the required tidal volume in tender specifications.</p> <p>The offered tidal volume is as under:</p> <p>Tidal Volume in PC mode: 0 to 1400 ml.</p> <p>Tidal Volume in VC mode: 20 to 1400 ml.</p>	<p>required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm.</p> <p>2. The firm told the committee that their quoted model has tidal volume from 5-1400 ml in pressure control ventilation mode. Upon the recommendation of end user, the committee accepted the grievance.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
05	VENTILATOR PEADS	<p>1. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE</p>	<p>1. CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules (annexures are attached). Also the most common factor of submission of bid security is in shape of CDR because it is the most reliable instrument of bank and secondly, bid security needs to submit for short period of time with submission of bid. In case of performance bond which needs to</p>	<p>1. The representative of the firm told the committee that CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules. the committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm.</p>	

				submit by successful bidder shall be in the form of Bank Guarantee because it needs to submit for longer period of time with purchaser.	<p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
06		VENTILATOR ICU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE 2. Paramagnetic sensor not verified from the brochure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules (annexures are attached). Also the most common factor of submission of bid security is in shape of CDR because it is the most reliable instrument of bank and secondly, bid security needs to submit for short period of time with submission of bid. In case of performance bond which needs to submit by successful bidder shall be in the form of Bank Guarantee because it needs to submit for longer period of time with purchaser. 2. We have quoted the ICU ventilator model Evita V600 manufactured by Dragerwerk, Germany. The quoted model Evita V600 have paramagnetic O2 sensor with the name PATO sensor, supporting documents attached. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm told the committee that CDR is the most reliable and the most common financial instrument used to submit with Bid as bid security as per PPRA rules. the committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that their quoted model Evita V600 have paramagnetic sensor with the name PATO sensor and presented the supporting documents. The committee observed that it was not clear from the documents if the PATO O2 sensor is a paramagnetic sensor or not, hence rejected the grievance of firm. <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>

6	M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	1. No CE of the quoted item attached with the bid	<p>1. Our quoted product is of Europe, Italy and CE marked. Kindly note that without CE approval product cannot be even manufactured locally or exported. Please find attached CE certificate. We request the committee to kindly approve us for healthy competition as the product is approved by the end user and there seem to be some error/confusion in regards to CE.</p>	<p>Mr. Tariq Lodhi represented M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The committee was apprised that the firm has not attached the CE certificate of the quoted item with the bid. The CE certificate attached with the bid was not of Dialysis chair. The representative of the firm submitted the CE certificate of Dialysis chair and told the committee that due to clerical mistake wrong CE certificate got attached with the bid.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee observed that as the original CE certificate of dialysis chair was not attached with the bid, hence it could not be accepted at this stage of tender as it may change the substance of the bid. The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
7	M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	<p>1. The product does not have minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally.</p> <p>2. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE</p> <p>3. Quoted product does not have required quality certificate i.e. MHLW</p> <p>4. Performance of the firm with PESSI regarding supply of</p>	<p>1. We are selling dialysis chairs from last two years, an email from principle M/S Paramount bed company- Japan is attached. Furthermore, we are also attaching herewith 2 years old order of 2019 from Ghurki Hospital- Lahore for Dialysis Chairs.</p> <p>2. As per PPRA circulation # L&M(PPRA)10-1/2011 Dated 29th July, 2020, "it is reiterated for the convenience of all that since principal form of security for bid and performance has</p>	<p>Mr. Sami Ullah represented M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The representative of the firm submitted 2 years old order of 2019 for dialysis chair but the committee decided not to accept the document at this stage of tender and rejected the grievance of firm.</p> <p>2. The representative of the firm told the committee that as per PPRA circulation # L&M(PPRA)10-1/2011 Dated 29th July, 2020, bid security can be accepted in the form of Bank Guarantee or CDR. The</p>

				<p>equipment fully compliant with the ordered specifications (if supply order was awarded in past)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Quoted model is not available on official website of manufacturer. 6. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 7. Arm rest is not rotatable, Arm rest dimension not available on brochure seat inclination not verified from brochure. 	<p>been defined as bank guarantee in the bid rules hence this would be the primary mode unless the bidder inclined to submit it in any other format i.e. CDR or Banker Cheque's"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. We have already attached CE certificate with our bid. However, we once again attaching herewith CE certificate of our quoted product. Furthermore, we are also attaching herewith MHLW certificate & ISO certificate of our quoted product. 4. Please note we have already taken order from PESSI for Ultrasound Machines x 6 (copy attached). Please also note M/S Medical Equipment & System is sister concern of M/S Medequips which is one of the Pakistan's largest Electro-Medical company. We have done number of projects with PESSI in past, copies of few projects are attached for your ready reference. 5. Our quoted product is available on manufacturers official website, please visit the mentioned link. 6. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 7. We would like to inform you that we have demonstrated our offered Dialysis Chair to end 	<p>committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The representative of the firm told that they have attached CE Certificate of the quoted product and submitted the MHLW certificate during the grievance period. The committee observed that as the country of manufacturer of the quoted product was Japan so it was mandatory for the product to have MHLW certificate. Furthermore, submission of MHLW certificate at this stage of tender was not possible as it will change the substance of the bid. Hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm. 4. The committee observed that as it was not necessarily required that the firm should have past experience with PESSI, hence accepted the grievance of the firm. 5. The representative of the firm showed the quoted product on the website of the manufacturer, hence the committee accepted the grievance of firm. 6. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm. 7. The representative of the firm stated that they have demonstrated the dialysis chair to the end user and confirmed that they their quoted dialysis chair has all the required feature; upon the recommendation of end user the grievance of the firm was accepted.
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>user Dr. Mohsin (Nephrologist) on advise of Director Purchase PESSI. We confirm you that our offered dialysis chair has rotate up and rotate down arm rest and have length and width more than the requirement. Our Dialysis Chair inclination position is 0-70 degree also can we verified from catalog.</p>	<p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>8. Hence M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
	07	TRANSPORT VENTILATORS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The product does not have minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally. 2. The firm submitted bid security in the form of CDR while according to bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of BANK GUARANTEE 3. Performance of the firm with PESSI regarding supply of equipment fully compliant with the ordered specifications (if supply order was awarded in past) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are attaching herewith an old order of Zoll Transport ventilators, which confirms you that Zoll Portable transport ventilators are in our market from more than two years. We are also attaching details herewith an email from Zoll Medical USA having detail of year of introduction of their Transport Ventilators. 2. As per PPRA circulation # L&M(PPRA)10-1/2011 Dated 29th July, 2020, “it is reiterated for the convenience of all that since principal form of security for bid and performance has been defined as bank guarantee in the bid rules hence this would be the primary mode unless the bidder inclined to submit it in any other format i.e. CDR or Banker Cheque’s” 3. Please note we have already taken order from PESSI for Ultrasound Machines x 6 (copy attached). Please also note M/S 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm submitted an older order of Zoll Transport Ventilator and also provided details of email from manufacturer stating the introduction of their transport ventilators, but the committee decided not to accept the document at this stage of tender and rejected the grievance of firm. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that as per PPRA circulation # L&M(PPRA)10-1/2011 Dated 29th July, 2020, bid security can be accepted in the form of Bank Guarantee or CDR. The committee observed that as per bidding documents the bid security was required in the form of Bank Guarantee, hence decided to Reject the grievance of the firm. 3. The committee observed that as it was not necessarily required that the firm should have past experience with PESSI, hence accepted the grievance of the firm.

					Medical Equipment & System is sister concern of M/S Medequips which is one of the Pakistan's largest Electro-Medical company. We have done number of projects with PESSI in past, copies of few projects are attached for your ready reference.	<p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
8	M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE	02	DIALYSIS MACHINE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No bicarbonate profiling, 2. no touch screen, 3. no variable dialysate flow, 4. time of battery backup not mentioned while the required battery backup time is for at least 20-min. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have installed 30 Fresenius dialysis machines of different models including the quoted model in various PESSI Hospitals which are running very successfully. (list attached) 2. the specs require bicarbonate profiling/proportioning. Our machine offers bicarbonate proportioning which meets tender specifications. 3. Touch screen has no clinical significance in delivering safe and adequate dialysis. Our machine offers the robust touch panel instead. Further, the bidding document allows to take the feature as minor deviation, having no compromise on treatment quality and equipment reliability, so this should be taken as minor deviation. 4. The digitally controlled variable dialysate flow between 0, 300, 500 and 800 ml/min is available which is authentic and eliminates human error in flow rate adjustment. 	<p>Mr. Saqib Maqbool represented M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm stated that the specs required bicarbonate profiling/proportioning. Our machine offers bicarbonate proportioning which meets tender specifications. The committee observed that as per specifications of tender bicarbonate profiling with monitoring was required parameter hence the committee rejected the grievance of the firm. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that their offered machine had robust touch panel instead of touch screen hence this should be taken as minor deviation. The committee rejected the grievance of the firm stating that the touch screen was an essential requirement of the tender specifications. 3. The representative of the firm stated that their machine had variable dialysate flow in steps like 0, 300, 500 and 800ml. The committee observed that the requirement of the tender was variable dialysate flow from 300 to 700ml, hence rejected the grievance of the firm.

				5.The backup time is not mentioned because it depends upon various factors like battery charging status, battery condition, machine condition and operating load. The 4008S Next Generation machine can operate on battery for 20 minutes or more.	4. The firm had not mentioned the battery backup time of the machine in its technical bid and the same was not verifiable from the brochure so the committee rejected the grievance of the firm. Decision: The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee. Hence M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE will remain NON-RESPONSIVE .
	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arm rest is not rotatable, 2. Arm rest dimension not available on brochure, seat 3. inclination 46 degree not verified from brochure, 4. upholstery dimensions not verified from brochure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Armrest (swivel) rotates laterally from the chair to 90 degrees. 2. Front swivel section 440 x 150-- ----back fixed section 400 x 150- -----total length 840 mm x 150 mm 3. Seat backrest inclines anywhere between 90 degrees and minus 11 degrees. 4. Seat: Width – 550mm Depth – 550mm Backrest Height – 800mm Width – 530mm Total length: 1800mm (Adjustable with remote control) 	<p>The committee asked the representative of the firm that why they have not attached the documentary proof/clarification of the dimensions when they knew that all of these dimensions are not mentioned in their product brochure. Also the documents cannot be accepted at this stage of tender as it will change the substance of the bid.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>

9	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	<p>1. Quoted monitor model not available on official website of the manufacturer.</p> <p>2. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>3. No brochure or technical data sheet of the quoted monitor attached</p>	<p>We confirm that the offered specification in bid are in fully compliance with your tender specifications.</p> <p>Please find the attached Purchase Orders from PESSI Hospitals in favor of EMTS reflecting the business history with your institution.</p> <p>1. Yes quoted product is available on company website: https://www.siare.it/en/</p> <p>2. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>3. The brochure and technical data sheet of the quoted monitor is already attached in the bid. We are reattaching the above said documents herewith this letter.</p>	<p>Mr. Zahid Baig represented M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The representative of the firm showed the quoted monitor on the website of the manufacturer, hence the committee accepted the grievance of firm.</p> <p>2. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm.</p> <p>3. Bid was checked again and no brochure or technical sheet of the monitor was attached with the bid. The firm submitted the technical sheet in grievance but the committee observed that submission of technical sheet at this stage of tender was not possible hence rejected the grievance of the firm.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
			VENTILATOR (PORTABLE)	<p>1. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p>	<p>Please find the attached Purchase Orders from PESSI Hospitals in favor of EMTS reflecting the</p>	<p>1. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were</p>

		07			<p>business history with your institution.</p> <p>1. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p>	<p>checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
10	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE	02	DIALYSIS MACHINE	<p>1. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>2. No disinfection history,</p> <p>3. No patient record option,</p>	<p>1. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>2. Last disinfection history is a standard feature of our quoted machine (mentioned in machine's operational manual comes with machine as well. (Copy enclosed)</p> <p>3. Patient record option kt/v is available in our quoted machine (mentioned in machine's operational manual comes with machine as well. (Copy enclosed)</p>	<p>Mr. Kamran represented M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <p>1. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again and 6 marks were increased in total score. After addition of 6 marks, the total score of the firm became 58 but still could not qualify. Committee accepted the grievance of firm.</p> <p>2. The representative of the firm clarified that the quoted machine has standard disinfection history parameter hence the committee accepted the grievance of the firm.</p> <p>3. The representative of the firm clarified that the quoted machine has patient record feature hence the committee accepted the grievance of the firm.</p>

					<p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee observed that as the firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS), therefore decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE will remain NON-RESPONSIVE</p>
	03	WRO SYSTEM FOR DIALYSIS MACHINE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 2. UPVC Fitting offered instead of HDPVC, 3. No manual operation in case Electrical Control Panel failure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 2. HD-PVC is not a professional term, the recommended fitting for WTS is UPVC schedule 80 (unplasticized polyvinyl chloride). You may verify from all dialysis centers in the region. 3. Manual emergency operation is available as a standard feature of our quoted model. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm. 2. The representative of the firm told the committee that recommended fitting for WTS is UPVC schedule 80 (unplasticized polyvinyl chloride), the committee accepted the grievance of the firm. 3. The representative of the firm told the committee that manual emergency operation is available as a standard feature of our quoted model), the committee accepted the grievance of the firm. <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee observed that as the firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS), therefore decided to Reject the grievance of the</p>

						<p>firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE will remain NON-RESPONSIVE</p>
		04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The product does not have minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally. 2. Quoted model is not available on official website of manufacturer. (Website was not available) 3. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 4. Upholstery dimension not verified from brochure, 5. central locking instead of individual castor lock, 6. Safe working load is 180 kg instead of 200 kg 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Detail brochure enclosed for your reference. 2.Please note that against all other tenders held under Punjab Government Institutes (PMU/ PSHD, Lodhran, Bhawalnagar, Jhelum, Chakwal, Bahawalpur in the same financial year 2020-2021 under same specifications our quoted model declared responsive without any technical reservation (Copies enclosed). We hereby therefore request you for the acceptance of our bid for the healthy and fair competition. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm could not clarify from the bid that the quoted product has minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally. 2. Quoted model was not available on official website of manufacturer 3. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm. 4. The firm submitted the detailed brochure in grievance but the committee observed that submission of technical sheet at this stage of tender was not possible hence rejected the grievance of the firm 5. Safe working load of the product is not in range. <p>Decision:</p> <p>The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>

11	M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demo unit of the firm was not satisfactory. 2. The vaporizer and monitor of the machine were of different manufacturer. Also the manufacturing of the machine was not satisfactory. 3. The end user anesthetist of Jinnah Hospital Lahore where the demo unit was placed, told that they did not use machine for long cases as the machine got heated after sometime and stopped ventilating automatically and needed to restart it again. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please note that our Engr. M. Awais demonstrated the machine satisfactorily. Answered all questions of End User (Dr. Sohail Anjum) Anesthetist at Social Security Hospital, Multan Road, Lahore. 2. It was already explained that Jinnah Hospital just purchased Machine only without Monitor and Vaporizers whereas, we had offered both items with other demanded accessories. Find enclosed the copy of purchase order along with our quotation for your ready reference. They already have monitor and vaporizer with them and using with our machine which is not our fault rather a versatility and acceptance of all Monitor and Vaporizer. 3. Please note that according to our and Jinnah Hospital record there was no any such issue arose, discussed, complained even brought in our notice till date. After seeing these comments, we immediately contacted with concerned end users, doctors, professors and paramedical staff of Jinnah Hospital to address this issue but since 25th May till date there is no any single person at Jinnah Hospital, Lahore of installed Anesthesia Machine addressing this issue for your ready reference and record. 	<p>Mr. Naveed represented M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS and appeared before the Grievance redressal committee for clarification,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm told the committee that they have demonstrated the machine satisfactorily and no issue has been reported to them by the administration of Jinnah Hospital till date. The committee asked the end user (Dr. Sohail Anjum) about the demonstration, he stated that the demo unit of the firm was not satisfactory. Also he consulted the end users of that machine (evening and morning shift) and their feedback was not satisfactory. Also the demo unit demonstrated was not complete i.e. the monitor and vaporizer were not of the same manufacturer. Upon which the representative of the firm added that the Jinnah hospital had only purchased Anesthesia Machine but not the monitor and vaporizer. The committee observed that as the firm already knew that they don't have complete system there then why they have not demonstrated the unit somewhere it was complete. 2. The committee also rejected the request of the firm to re-demonstrate the machine. <p><u>Decision:</u> The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>
----	-----------------------------	----	------------------------------------	---	---	--

					4. We take this opportunity and inform you that we have Anesthesia Machine, offered model Apux x2, complete unit with Vaporizer and Vital Sign of the same manufacturer ready for demonstration to dispel the misconceptions (find enclosed the pictures). Kindly allow us to demonstrate the same machine with full functionality in front of an independent neutral panel which you will propose.	
		07	VENTILATOR PORTABLE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The product does not have minimum two-years market experience locally or internationally. 2. The firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Find enclosed the copies of purchase orders local and international references as well as performance certificates of offered model. 2. Provided documents for clarifications of Part B: ASSESSMENT ARAMETERS (BIDDERS) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representative of the firm submitted old order for Ventilator (Portable) but the committee decided not to accept the document at this stage of tender and rejected the grievance of firm. 2. The representative of the firm requested the committee to recheck some of the points of the Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS) of their bid, the points were checked again but no mistake was found in the total marks of the bid that were displayed in technical evaluation report, hence the committee rejected the grievance of firm. <p><u>Decision:</u> The committee decided to Reject the grievance of the firm and upheld the decision of Technical Evaluation committee.</p> <p>Hence M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS will remain NON-RESPONSIVE.</p>

GRIEVANCES/REPRESENTATIONS AGAINST FIRMS.

SR. No.	Item #	Name of Item	Grievance submitted by firm	Grievance submitted against firm	Grievance of firm	Clarification/Reply of firm	Decision of the Grievance Committee
1	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD.	M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The firm has quoted the Anesthesia Machine manufactured by Axcen Medical, Germany which does not comply with the evaluation criteria. They are not original manufacturer, the original manufacturer is Resvent Medical Technology Co., Ltd China. The Evidence is attached. CE certificate is not confirmed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm presented original embassy attested authorization certificate of the manufacturer. He also told the committee that M/S Radiant Medical Solutions was making false statement. In another tender they have told the procuring agency that the original manufacturer was Northern Medictec China. Hence their own statement is contradictory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee listened to both the firms and observed the supporting documents submitted by both firms. <p><u>Decision:</u> The Grievance of the firm against M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
				M/S DIGIONICS (PVT.) LIMITED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They have very poor after sales services in Services Hospital, Lahore and Rawalpindi Institute of Urology and Kidney Transplantation. Their bids are not technically accepted in these Public Sector Procurement due to poor after sales services. (copies enclosed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm told the committee that due to some civil works the installation of DR system got delayed in the hospital and presented the supporting documents for clarifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed the facts presented by the firm for clarification and decided to reject the grievance of the firm. <p><u>Decision:</u> The Grievance of the firm against M/S DIGIONICS (PVT.) LIMITED is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
2	05 & 06	VENTILATOR PEADS & VENTILATOR ICU	M/S TOTAL TECHNOLOGIES (PVT) LTD	M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that the performance of their quoted brand is not satisfactory wherein “non-satisfactory” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm submitted the repeat supply orders by the public institute and stated that if their performance was not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed the facts given by both firms and also stated that the certificate of “non-satisfactory” was not issued by the head of the institute.

					<p>remarks from a reputable institute is also attached for your ready reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on above facts, their offer should stand as “non-responsive”. 	<p>satisfactory then why would an institute will give them repeated orders.</p>	<p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S CLINICAL LIFE INC is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
3	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	M/S VERTEX MEDICAL (PVT) LTD	M/S DIGIONICS PVT LTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quoted model Penlon Prima 320 does not have required tidal volume and fulfilled the tender specifications. Offered tidal volume is 10 to 1600ml. Lower limit not as per the required tidal volume. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm told the committee that their quoted model has tidal volume from 0-1600 ml in pressure control ventilation mode. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed that the firm has offered tidal volume 0 to 1600ml in pressure control ventilation mode which is also verified from the technical sheet attached with the bid. <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S DIGIONICS (PVT.) LIMITED is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
4	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY	M/S JAMSUNG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/S JAMSUNG quoted brand SEERS MEDICAL LTD, Model NV3491-CLS-1WH has no past performance in Pakistan government sector and neither has this brand been seen ever but still is approved. It is requested to look into it. The quoted model is not available on manufacturers website. The quoted model has no Certification. References of quoted item supplied in public/private organizations----20 marks are being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm showed the quoted model on the official website of the manufacturer. The CE certificate of the item was presented in front of committee. All the supporting documents were submitted to committee for clarifications. 	<p>The committee observed that the training certificates of the firm were suspicious and also the firm could not present the supply order of the quoted item issued by the public institute. The performance certificate attached with the Bid was not issued by head of the institute. Hence the firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S Jamsung is “ACCEPTED” and the firm is declared “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>

					<p>allocated against the same out of which 16 marks have been given. Kindly re-check the same as the firm do not comply to get 16 marks against this which have been given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on the quoted product-----the company has been allocated 4 marks whereas per market information the company has not been seen in this product specialty apart from this tender. Therefore 4 marks should not be given. • Inventory----- 12 marks have been given against these. When a company is not even dealing in the specified product then how could they fulfill all the requirement as per criteria. It is requested to look into as this is for the first time this company is quoting this brand of dialysis chair. • In view of above, M/S JAMSUNG does not qualify. 		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

5	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS	M/S JAMSUNG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M/S JAMSUNG do not have any past performance experience with PESSI (copy attached) and surprisingly M/S JAMSUNG is technically responsive. • M/S JAMSUNG offered Dialysis Chair model NV-3491-CLS-1WH of SEERS Medical-UK is not available on official website which is mandatory requirement of tender. • We also want to inform that we are doing business for Medical Furniture from decades and never faced competition with the only qualified bidder M/S JAMSUNG. We have doubt on the provided documents by M/S JAMSUNG and would like to request you for the verification of submitted documents for the Part B: Assessment parameters by M/S JAMSUNG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The representative of the firm stated that it was not necessary required that the firm should have past experience with PESSI • The representative of the firm showed the quoted item on the official web site of manufacturer 	<p>The committee observed that the training certificates of the firm were suspicious and also the firm could not present the supply order of the quoted item issued by the public institute. The performance certificate attached with the Bid was not issued by head of the institute. Hence the firm could not score minimum 70 marks in Part B: ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS (BIDDERS)</p> <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S Jamsung is “ACCEPTED” and the firm is declared “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>
6	04	DIALYSIS CHAIR	M/S JAMSUNG	M/S IQBAL AND COMPANY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their quoted product does not fulfill the technical criteria as the quoted product model is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The representative of the firm stated that they have demonstrated the quoted Dialysis Chair to the end user. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee observed that the firm has not attached the CE certificate of the quoted item with the bid. The CE certificate attached with the bid was not of Dialysis chair.

					<p>blood donor chair and not the dialysis chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quoted model is not mentioned on CE certificate so this product does not have any CE certificate. There is no seat inclination between 4 to 50 degree in the quoted product model as per the requirements of PVMS. Castors of the quoted product model are not inter-lockable which is the requirement of the PVMS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The firm has presented the CE Certificate of the quoted model The representative of the firm stated that the Technical data sheet is already attach with the Bid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed that as the original CE certificate of dialysis chair was not attached with the bid, hence it could not be accepted at this stage of tender as it may change the substance of the bid. <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S Iqbal & Company is “ACCEPTED” and the firm will remain “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>
7	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES	M/S DIGIONICS PVT LTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder has quoted Anesthesia machine with Ventilator with brand “Penlon, UK and model Prima 320/Annavue 4000”. We request you to review the tidal volume of the quoted model, to assure that the quoted equipment fully comply with your desired specifications. Relevant brochure is attached herewith for your reference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm told the committee that their quoted model has tidal volume from 0-1600 ml in pressure control ventilation mode. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed that the firm has offered tidal volume 0 to 1600ml in pressure control ventilation mode which is also verified from the technical sheet attached with the bid. <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S DIGIONICS (PVT.) LIMITED is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
	07	VENTILATOR (PORTABLE)		M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder has quoted Ventilator (Portable) with brand “Axcent Medical, Germany and model MUSCA X2”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm told the committee that trend data feature is available in their quoted model. the feature is not mentioned on brochure as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee observed the clarifications given by the firm and also checked the technical offer of the firm.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quoted model does not have the availability of trend data. Alongside this the quoted model does not have any local business history. 	<p>everything cannot be covered in it. We have already mentioned in our technical offer that the system has trend data availability.</p>	<p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTION is “NOT ACCEPTED”</p>
08	02	DIALYSIS MACHINE	M/S EASTERN MEDICAL CARE	M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quoted model is not latest as Fresenius quoted 5008 machine as well in the past tenders (copy TE reports enclosed); further the quoted model 4008S (NS) did not meet the following tender specifications hence should be declared non responsive on technical grounds. Fresenius Bibag is not Universal. Its Patent of Fresenius and only available with Fresenius till 2033. Further, firm forces hospitals to use their disinfectant solution only (Citrosteril) – copies are enclosed for reference. Touch screen display is not available in the quoted model. display for service and diagnostic not available, need to attach laptop with external software to view the flow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The representative of the firm told the committee that 5008 machine was HDF machine hence could not be quoted here. He told that the quoted machine is universal. He told that the touch screen had no clinical importance so should be considered as minor deviation. He told the committee that the quoted machine has more than 20 min battery backup. 	<p>The committee observed that the firm had touch screen available in another model which also met the specifications of the tender, then why firm has not quoted that model. also the quoted model does not have the disinfection history feature.</p> <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S FRESENIUS MEDICAL CARE is “ACCEPTED” and the firm will remain “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>

					<p>diagram for diagnostic and troubleshoot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability to record disinfection history is not available in the quoted model. • Battery backup is less than 20 mins. (15 mins) as indicated in the TE report hence should be rejected. 		
9	01	ANESTHESIA MACHINE WITH VENTILATOR	M/S SAARF MEDICAL SOLUTIONS	M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The firm offered Anesthesia Machine model “Siesta I Whispa” brand Dameca, Denmark. • Please refer to advertised technical specifications (copy enclosed) where it is clearly mentioned that, “Note: Vital Sign Monitor must be supplied by the same manufacturer” copy enclosed for your ready reference. whereas the bidder offered Anesthesia Machine and Vital Sign Monitor from two different manufacturers and different country of manufacturer. • In the light of above facts, you are requested to upheld the decision of 	<p>The representative of the firm told that they have already mentioned in their technical bid that Monitor shall be provided by the same manufacturer will be compatible with the Anesthesia Machine and Ventilator.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee observed that there was no certificate attached with the bid of the firm which indicated that the manufacturer of Anesthesia Machine has any kind of contract with the manufacturer of the Patient monitor. <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S RADIANT MEDICAL (PVT) LTD. is “ACCEPTED” and the firm will remain “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>

					TEC and keep Non-Responsive the offered bidder/model for the best interest of patients.		
				M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The firm offered Anesthesia Machine model “Morpheus M” brand SIARE, Italy. There is no any past performance of above mentioned offered model in public hospital or teaching institute in Pakistan. Due to this reason the model disqualified in Gujranwala Medical college, find enclosed the copy of technical evaluation report as well as minutes of meeting of grievance for your ready reference. Also please check your past record and scrutinize the performance of the firm with PESSI regarding supply of equipment fully compliant with the ordered specifications. We wish to mention here that there were two cases where the bidder had poor performance; <p>1) Supply of ICU Ventilators in around 2009-10</p>	The representative of the firm submitted the documents for the clarification and stated that they have sold many Anesthesia Machines across the country.	<p>The committee observed the documents provided by both firms for clarification. The committee found that the performance certificates provided by the firm were not on the letter head of the institute and not by the head of the institute.</p> <p>Decision: The Grievance of the firm against M/S EASTERN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES SERVICES is “ACCEPTED” and the firm will remain “NON-RESPONSIVE”</p>

					<p>2) Supply of X-Ray in around 2016-17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the light of above facts, you are requested to upheld the decision of TEC and keep Non-Responsive the offered model for the best interest of patients.		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--