

SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

(As Per rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Name of Procuring Agency | IESCO |
| 2. Method of Procurement | Single Stage, Two Envelop |
| 3. Title of Procurement | Rate contract for Computers, Laptops, Printers, UPS and Software. |
| 4. Tender Enquiry No | RC-01/2020 |
| 5. PPRA Ref No. | TS426979E |
| 6. Date and Time of Bid Closing | 10.08.2020 at 11:00 A.M |
| 7. Date and Time of Bid Opening | 10.08.2020 at 11:30 A.M |
| 8. No. of Bids Received | 06 |
| 9. Criteria of Bid Evaluation | Single Stage Two Envelope |
| 10. Details of Bid Evaluation | Following is the bid evaluation report / comparative Statement of the bid amount after checking and correction. |

LOT A			Financial Quote						Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Evaluation Status	A-1 Core i5 Branded Desktop	A-2 Core i7 Branded Desktop	A-3 Core i5 Branded All in One Desktop	A-4 Core i7 Branded All in One Desktop	A-5 Core i5 Branded Laptop	A-6 Core i7 Branded Laptop	
1.	Megaplus	Qualified	156108.00	190252.00	162620.00	224220.00	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	<p>Accepted: Bid accepted for item A-3 being reasonable in price and technically qualified..</p> <p>Rejected: Bid Rejected for Item A-1, A-2, & A-4 being abnormally high then estimated price.</p> <p>Not Responsive For: • A-5 & A-6 = Low base processor speed.</p>

Recommendation

Based on detail evaluation, it is recommended that for item

- A-3 Megaplus, may be considered for award of PO/Contract Agreement after approval of competent authority in light of rules and regulations.
- A-1, A-2 & A-4 Megaplus bid may be rejected based on higher then estimated cost.

LOT B

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Evaluation Status	Financial Quote						Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
			B-1 38 PPM Laser Jet Printer (B&W)	B-2 18 PPM Laser Jet Printer (Colour)	B-3 60-65 PPM Laser Jet Printer (B&W)	B-4 22 ppm Laser Jet (Multifunction)	B-5 40 ppm Laser Jet (Multifunction)	B-6 Laser Jet Printer (A3) (Multifunction)	
1.	Pakland Corp. (Pvt.) Ltd.	Qualified	33815.40	114974.36 (Lowest)	161040.17 (Lowest)	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	142027.35	Accepted: Bid Accepted for Item B-3 being the Lowest and Technically Qualified. Rejected: Bid rejected for item B-2 being abnormally high. Not Responsive For: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B-4 & B-5 = Fax memory pages not mentioned.
2.	GEMCO	Qualified	20000.00 (Lowest)	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	37000.00 (Lowest)	37000.00 (Lowest)	239300.00	Accepted: Bid Accepted for item B-1, B-4 & B-5 being the Lowest and Technically Qualified. Not Responsive For: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B-2 = Processor 133 MHz instead of 800 MHz, B-3 = Input less than 1000 sheets
3.	Mushko Printing Solutions (Pvt.) Ltd.	Qualified	40208.00	Not Responsive	476224.00	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	126224.00 (Lowest)	Accepted: Bid Accepted for item B-6 being the Lowest and Technically Qualified. Not Responsive For: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B-2 = multipurpose tray 1 capacity is 1 sheet instead of 50, B-4 = Lesser RAM, No FAX, No Ethernet, B-5 = fax memory pages 250 instead of 300 pages
4.	Megaplus	Qualified	40916.24	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	Not Responsive	457299.15	Rejected: Bid Rejected for Item B-1 & B-6 financially. Not Responsive For: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B-2 = multipurpose tray 1 capacity is 1 sheet instead of 50, B-3 = Processor 792 MHz less than 1GHz, B-4 = 256 pages Fax memory instead of 500 pages, B-5 = printer speed 38ppm instead of 40 ppm

Recommendation

Based on detail evaluation, it is recommended that for Item

- B-1, B-4 & B-5** GEMCO, may be considered for award of PO/Contract Agreement after approval of competent authority in light of rules and regulations.
- B-3** Pakland Corp. (Pvt.) Ltd., may be considered for award of PO/Contract Agreement after approval of competent authority in light of rules and regulations.
- B-6** Mushko Printing Solutions (Pvt.) Ltd, may be considered for award of PO/Contract Agreement after approval of competent authority in light of rules and regulations.

LOT C

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Evaluation Status	Financial Quote		Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
			C-1 650VA UPS	C-2 1 KVA UPS	
1.	SM. Jaffer & Co.	Qualified	8462.00 (Lowest)	20428.00	Rejected: Bid Rejected for item C-1 being higher than estimated cost.
2.	GEMCO	Qualified	Not Responsive	12800.00 (Lowest)	Accepted: Bid Accepted for item C-2 being the Lowest and Technically Qualified. Not Responsive For: ▪ C-1 = battery 7Ah instead of 9Ah battery
3.	M/s Makkays	Qualified	10949.70	21899.40	Rejected: Bid Rejected for Item C-1 & C-2 financially.

Recommendation

Based on detail evaluation, it is recommended that for Item

- C-1 SM. Jaffer & Co., bid may be rejected based on higher then estimated cost..
- C-2 GEMCO, may be considered for award of PO/Contract Agreement after approval of competent authority in light of rules and regulations.


LOT D

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Evaluation Status	Financial Quote							Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/ Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004.
			D-1 (Microsoft Software)					D-2 (Antivirus Software)		
			A Microsoft Office Pro (latest) with Media Kit	B Microsoft Office Pro (latest) with digital delivery	C Microsoft Office Pro Plus (latest) OLP License	D Microsoft Office 365 Family	E Windows 10 Pro 64 bit	A Antivirus for servers	B Antivirus for Single Users	
1.	Megaplus	Qualified	Not Responsive	95040.00	98560.00	Not Responsive	29040.00	23760.00	23760.00	Rejected: Bid Rejected for Item D-1 (B, C, & E) & D-2 (A & B) because of higher than estimated price. Not Responsive For: ▪ D-1 (A) = Due to Media Less, D-1 (D) = Business essential instead of office 365 family.

Recommendation

Based on detail evaluation, it is recommended that for Item

- D-1 (B, C, E) & D-2 (A, B) Megaplus bid may be rejected based on higher then estimated cost.


 Director General (IS)
 IT Directorate, IESCO HQ