

# BID EVALUATION REPORT (30.03.2020)

(As Per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)

1	Name of Procuring Agency:	Zarai Taraqati Bank Limited
2	Method of Procurement:	'Least Cost Selection Method' as provided in Regulation 3(C) of the Procurement of Consultancy Services Regulations, 2010.
3	Title of Procurement:	Procurement of Consultancy Services for Revision of Organizational Structure & Employees' Compensation
4	Tender Inquiry No.:	ZTBL-HR-01-2020
5	PPRA Ref. No. (TSE):	TS414636E
6	Date & Time of Bid Closing:	March 02, 2020 11:00 AM
7	Date & Time of Bid Opening:	March 02, 2020 11:30 AM (Technical Proposals) March 27, 2020 11:00 AM (Financial Proposals)
8	No of Bids Received:	Eight (08)
9	Criteria for Bid Evaluation:	As prescribed in the Bidding Document / RFP

## 10 Details of Bid(s) Evaluation:

### 10.1 Technical Proposals Evaluation:

#	Name of Bidder	Technically Responsive
1	M/s HRSG Consulting (HRSG)	No (See Note 1)
2	M/s BDO Ebrahim & Co (BDO)	No (See Note 2)
3	M/s Naveed Zaffar Ashfaq Jaffery (NZAJ)	No (See Note 3)
4	M/s RSM Avias Hyder Liaquat Nauman (RSM)	No (See Note 4)
5	M/s UHY Hassan Naeem & Co (UHY)	No (See Note 5)
6	M/s Sidat Hyder Morshed Associates (SHMA)	No (See Note 6)
7	M/s KPMG Taseer Hadi & Co (KPMG)	Yes (See Note 7)
8	M/s EY Ford Rhodes (EYFR)	Yes (See Note 7)

### 10.2 Financial Proposals Evaluation:

Financial Proposals and Bid Securities of the two (2) technically responsive bidders were opened on March 27, 2020 @ 11:00 AM, as per blow details:

#	Name of Bidder	Total Offered Price (Pak Rs)	Amount of Bid Security (Pak Rs)	Bid Accepted / Rejected
1	KPMG	=11,020,000/-	=190,000/-	Bid Rejected (See Note 8)
2	EYFR	=16,750,000/-	=335,000/-	Bid Accepted (See Note 9)

### 10.3 Lowest Evaluated Bidder: M/s EY Ford Rhodes (EYFR)

~~SD~~  
Mehboob Ur Rehman,  
Head(HRPD)/Secretary(SC)

~~SD~~  
Hassan Raza,  
Head(SLMD)/Member(SC)

~~SD~~  
Khurram Saeed Khan,  
Head(HROD)/Member(SC)

~~SD~~  
Rana Mujahid Ali Khan,  
Head(HR)/Convener(SC)

**Note - 1:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s HRSG Consulting was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason(s):

- a. Non-Compliance to Condition No. (4) of the Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that the firm must have provided similar services in Pakistan to at-least one client. As per submitted bid, M/s HRSG has not provided similar consultancy services for review of organizational structure to any local client in financial/banking sector.
- b. Non-Compliance to Condition No. (5) of the Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that firm shall be profitable for the last 3 years. However, the HRSG's annual accounts show losses for the year 2018 and 2019.

**Note - 2:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s BDO Ebrahim & Co (BDO) was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason:

Non-Compliance to Condition No. (4) of Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that firm must have provided similar services in Pakistan to at-least one client. However, as per submitted bid, M/s BDO has not provided similar services for revision of organizational structure and Employees compensation to any local client in financial/banking sector.

**Note - 3:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s Naveed Zaffar Ashfaq Jaffery (NZAJ) was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason:

Non-Compliance to Condition No. (4) of Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that firm must have provided similar services in Pakistan to at-least one client. However, as per submitted bid, M/s NZAJ has not provided similar consultancy services for review of organizational structure and Employees' Compensation to any local client in financial/banking sector.

**Note - 4:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s RSM Avias Hyder Liaquat Nauman (RSM) was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason:

Non-Compliance to Condition No. (4) of Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that firm must have provided similar services in Pakistan to at-least one client. However, as per submitted bid, M/s RSM has not provided similar consultancy services for review of organizational structure and Employees' Compensation to any local client in financial/ banking sector.

**Note - 5:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s UHY Hassan Naeem & Co (UHY) was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason:

Non-Compliance to Condition No. (4) of Qualification Criteria mentioned in Bidding Document whereby it was required that firm must have provided similar services in Pakistan to at-least one client. However, as per submitted bid, M/s UHY has not provided similar consultancy services for review of organizational structure and Employees' Compensation to any local client in financial/banking sector.

**Note - 6:**

The technical proposal submitted by M/s Sidat Hyder Morshed Associates (SHMA) was found as 'Technically Non-Responsive' due to following reason:

As per Section 5.2(2) of the Bidding Document/RFP, the score of 70 (seventy) was defined as “Technical Score Threshold” whereas the technical proposal submitted by M/s Sidat Hyder Morshed Associates obtained total score of fifty-two (52) as a result of evaluation carried out in accordance with “Evaluation Criteria for Technical Proposals” specified in bidding document. Details of technical evaluation are given below:

Evaluation Criteria of Technical				Total Technical Score Obtained
Firm’s Age	Similar Experience	Proposed Team Strength	Proposed Methodology, Approach	
10	10	14	18	52

**Note - 7:**

The technical proposals submitted by M/s KPMG Taseer Hadi & Co and M/s EY Ford Rhodes were found as ‘Technically Responsive’. Hence, their bids were technically accepted by Procuring Agency and considered for further evaluation. The score assigned to technical proposals of both bidders in accordance with “Evaluation Criteria for Technical Proposals” specified in bidding document, is as follows:

#	Name of Bidder	Evaluation Criteria of Technical				Total Technical Score
		Firm’s Age	Similar Experience	Proposed Team Strength	Proposed Methodology, Approach	
1	M/s KPMG	10	20	22	19	71
2	M/s EYFR	10	25	20	19	74

**Note - 8:**

- a. The Section (2.9) of the Bidding Document/RFP required that:
  - “1. A bid security amounting to at least 2% of the total quoted price (including all applicable taxes) shall be submitted, in form of Pay Order (PO), Demand Draft (DD) or Call Deposit Receipt (CDR), in favor of Zarai Taraqiati Bank Limited, at the time of bid submission in an envelope marked as “Bid Security”, separate from technical as well as financial proposals.
  2. Any bid not secured by “Bid Security” shall be considered as rejected.
  3. If “Bid Security” is found less than 2% of the total quoted price, the bid shall be considered as rejected at any stage.”
- b. On the occasion of opening of financial proposals and bid security held on 27.03.2020, it was observed that M/s KPMG has submitted Bid Security in the form of Banker Cheque bearing Ref No. 856491 issued by Askari Bank, Blue Area Branch, Islamabad on 27.02.2020 amounting to Rs. 190,000/-. The amount of bid security was found less than required amount of 2% of the total quoted price (i.e. Rs. 11,020,000\*2% = Rs. 220,400/-).
- c. Accordingly, the bid submitted by M/s KPMG was rejected due to non-compliance to requirements mentioned in Section 2.9(3) of the Bidding Document/RFP.

**Note - 9:**

- a. On the occasion of opening of financial proposals and bid security held on 27.03.2020, it was observed that M/s EYFR has submitted Bid Security in the form of Pay Order bearing Ref No. 04479352 issued by Standard Chartered Bank, UNDP Tower Branch, Islamabad Branch on 28.02.2020 amounting to Rs. 335,000/-. The amount of bid security was found equal to required amount of 2% of the total quoted price (i.e. Rs. 16,750,000\*2% = Rs. 335,000/-).
- b. Accordingly, the bid submitted by M/s EYFR was accepted.

\*\*\*\*\*