## EVALUATION REPORT OF TRACK AND TRACE SYSTEM, FBR

1.	Name of Procuring Agency	Federal Board of Revenue			
2.	Method of Procurement	Single stage two envelops			
3.	Title of Procurement	Invitations for Licensing for IT-based solution for Electronic Monitoring (Track and Trace System) for tobacco products.			
4.	Tender Inquiry No.	TS397083E			
5.	PPRA Ref No. (TSE)	TS397083E			
6.	Date & Time of Bid closing	1700 hours on 27 <sup>th</sup> September, 2019			
7.	Date & Time of bid opening	1730 hours on 27 <sup>th</sup> September, 2019			
8.	No of Bids received	13			
9.	Criteria for Bid Evaluation	One stage two envelop (Lowest Evaluated Bid)			
10	Details of bids evaluation:	As under			

	Name of Bidder	Marks		Evaluated Cost per 1000 stamps	Rules/Regulations/SBD*/Policy/Basis for Rejection/Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004
K		Technical (if applicable)	Financial (if applicable)	,	
1.	NRTC	NA	NA	Rs.0.731	The bidder has offered price of Rs.0.731 with the unit of 1000 stamps. However, the bidder claimed that this price quoted is per one stamp and not per quoted 1000 stamps. As per Annex-6 of IFL, the bidder was required to offer rate per 1000 stamps and not per stamp. Therefore, the rate quoted in the bid is to be taken such i.e. 0.731 per 1000 stamps. However, if contention of the bidder is accepted, the cost comes to Rs.731 per 1000 stamps. Apparently the bidder has violated Annex-6 of the IFL and if the bidder does not agree to Rs.0.731 per 1000 stamps, the next lowest responsive bidder (i.e. NIFT) may be offered the license.
2.	SICPA	NA	NA	Rs.799	The following 03 conditions, among others, have been submitted in the

SICPA SA/Arwentec  NA  NA  Rs.799  The following 03 condition others, have been submit financial offer, which rebidder disqualified becamade with conditional financial for the annual to communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assudelivered in reels of 40k	tted in the render the ause it has acial offer:- ve are only stal volume dimentioned
financial offer, which rebidder disqualified becamade with conditional financial offer, which rebidder disqualified becamade with conditional financial offer disqualified becamade with conditional financial offer, which rebidder disqualified becamade with conditional financial offer disqualif	render the ause it has acial offer:- ve are only stal volume dimentioned
(1) All prices quoted above valid for the annual total communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	ve are only stal volumed mentioned
(1) All prices quoted above valid for the annual to communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	ve are only stal volume d mentioned
valid for the annual tot communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	tal volume d mentioned
valid for the annual tot communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	tal volume d mentioned
valid for the annual tot communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	tal volume d mentioned
communicated by FBR and in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	d mentioned
in Annex-6  (2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	
(2) As described in the proposal, stamps are assu	: Technical
proposal, stamps are assu	· Technical
proposal, stamps are assu	Technical
proposal, stamps are assu	recillical
	imed to be
delivered in recis of 40k	
and the production control	
to be installed on a maxing	
lines across 18 sites.	
(3) SICPA reserves the righ	the state of the s
the pricing accordingly sh	iould above
conditions change.	
3. NIFT NA NA Rs.868.36	
CONSORTIUM	
	1 C
4. DE LA RU & NTL NA NA Rs.882.36 The bidder has offered p	Samuel Sa
GBP Pound 4.56 with the of Pak Rs.193.499 per Po	
26.09.2019, which equates	
Rs.882.36 per 1000 stam	Designation of the partition of the second
IFL, bidder was required to	
in Pak rupees and not	
currency, which does not re	
due to fluctuation of foreign	
rates. The bidder has also s	753
quoted bid that "proposed to	o agree with
manufacturers alongwith	
terms and conditions, that	the Invoice
Price for any payments wh	
in GBP will be deter	
multiplying the price of Pou	- 1
the appropriate currency	the state of the s
versus GBP at the time of e	The second secon
That renders the bi	MO SE CLASS
	aking it
conditional and not que	200
unqualified price. The fir raised certain other con	
Annex-C. All these in toto	TO STANDARD STANDARD STANDARD STANDARD
bidder disqualified.	render the
biduei disquanned.	

5.	Reliance IT Solutions (Pvt) Ltd	NA	NA	Rs.987	
6.	STEUERMAAKEN SOLUTÍON (PVT)LTD	NA	NA	Rs.1,191	
7.	AUTHENTIX INC. JAFFER BROTHERS CONSOTIUM (JBL)	NA .	NA	Rs.1,250	· .
8.	ITECHNOLOGY	NA	NA	Rs.3,450	
9.	Synavos Solutions (Pvt) Ltd	NA	NA	Not responsive	A number of missing documents were requisitioned vide letter dated 2 <sup>nd</sup> October, 2019 latest by 1300 hours on 07.10.2019. The company failed to submit none of the documents within the given time.
10.	Beijing Santel Technology & Trading Co.	NA	NA	Not responsive	M/s Santel Technology Pakistan (Pvt) Ltd, a company incorporated with SECP, is not a partner in the JV Agreement while all other partners are foreign companies. Thus, the company has not fulfilled the requirement of sub-rule (h) of Sub-rule (2) of 150ZK of Sales Tax Rules, 2006 as amended vide SRO 250(I)/2019 dated 26.02.2019.
11.	Ora-Tech System Pvt Ltd	NA	NA	Not responsive	A number of missing documents were requisitioned vide letter dated 2 <sup>nd</sup> October, 2019 latest by 1300 hours on 07.10.2019. Although company submitted some documents but has not submitted following four (04) mandatory documents within the given time:-
×					<ul> <li>(a). Documents showing relevant experience in Track and Trace;</li> <li>(b). Complete history of activities undertaken;</li> <li>(c). Annex-2 additional technical requirements;</li> <li>(d). Annex-5 Bidding process &amp; evaluation criteria;</li> </ul>

12.	Eagle Fly -Capital	NA	NA	Not	Consortium Agreement filed with the
	Services System		\$ P	responsive	bid has three partners and none is
				DE DADRO	registered/incorporated with SECP. In
				55	response to Board's letter instead of
	€ .	0			submitting incorporation certificate of
				10	the existing partners, the company
	2, #	98		3	formed altogether a new consortium
	22 UN				with a fourth partner, which is
	*				incorporated with SECP. New
	5 8				consortium agreement cannot be
	7			01	accepted under PPRA Rules, 2004 as it
					is changing the bid materially. Hence
		18			the bid cannot be considered.
13.	CRPT (MMT&T)	NA	NA	Not	After evaluation of the documents
	Associates			responsive	filed in respect of FBR's letter
	9 20				dated 02.10.2019 as well as
	- "	n n			practical demonstration given by
8	15				the company on 09.10.2019, the
	V.				Licensing Committee has found
			ž		that as per Part 2-A of Annex-5 to
	:5				the Invitation for License (IFL)-
	8	*			state and a second seco
					Track and Trace System and in
		:8	13		terms of Rule 150ZL(2)(b) of Sales
				D, SE	Tax Rules, 2006 as amended vide
				100	SRO 250(I)/2019 dated 26.02.2019,
					they do not possess the requisite
					experience and capability (which
					carries 35 marks). As a result, the
	3				Licensing Committee has found
					that the company is <b>not technically</b>
				76	qualified.
				13	quanneu.

## Lowest Evaluated Bidder: National Radio Telecommunication Corporation (NRTC)

11. Any other additional/supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share. This report is being issued on the basis of recommendations contained in Minutes of Meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2019 at FBR-HQs, Islamabad.

Signature.

14/10/2019

(TARIQ HUSSAIN SHAIKH)

PROJECT DIRECTOR(T&TS), FBR