

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT**  
**(As Per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)**

1. Name of Procuring Agency: Gilgit Development Authority represented Project Director PMU Sewerage and Sanitation system for Gilgit city
2. Method of Procurement: QCBS (T:F:: 80:20)
3. Title of Procurement: Project Management Consultancy Services for Sewerage and Sanitation System for Gilgit city
4. Tender Inquiry No.: PD/SSGLT/PMU/PMC/2022/1(12)/03
5. PPRA Ref. No. (TSE): TS499162E
6. Date & Time of Bid Closing: As per original advertisement: 17<sup>th</sup> January 2023 & 11:30 a.m Extended Time : 25<sup>th</sup> January 2023 & 11:30 A.M
7. Date & Time of Bid Opening: 25<sup>th</sup> January 2023 & 12:00 P.M
8. No of Bids Received: Five (05)
9. Criteria for Bid Evaluation: As per the Evaluation criteria set in the RFP i.e., Organizational Profile, General Experience, Similar Experience, Financial Soundness, Work Plan, approach and Methodology, competence of Key Experts/Personnel proposed for the project
10. Details of Bid(s) Evaluation: Results of Technical Proposals Evaluation are tabulated as below: (Detailed evaluation sheets are also attached As Annexure –A)

Name of Bidder	Technical Marks (if applicable)	Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/Basis for Technical Rejection / Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP Rules,2004.
1. M/s EMC (JV) M/s Wajedo International Corporation Pvt. Ltd	324	The technical proposal was evaluated as per the detailed eligibility and qualification criteria given in RFP. The proposal could not qualify to score min qualifying marks. Hence Declared Technically non-responsive as per the requirement of RFP.(detailed evaluation sheets attached)
2. M/s EPCM in Association with PEPAC	416	The technical proposal was evaluated as per the detailed eligibility and qualification criteria given in RFP. The proposal could not qualify to score min qualifying marks. Hence Declared Technically non-responsive as per the requirement of RFP.(detailed evaluation sheets attached)
3. M/s Umar Munshi Associates (UMA) Karachi	820.6 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Ranked)	The technical proposal was evaluated as per the detailed eligibility and qualification criteria given in RFP. The proposal qualify to score min qualifying marks. Hence Declared Technically responsive as per the requirement of RFP. (detailed evaluation sheets attached).
4. M/s NESPAK Pvt Ltd Lahore	883 (1 <sup>st</sup> Ranked)	The technical proposal was evaluated as per the detailed eligibility and qualification criteria given in RFP. The proposal qualify to score min qualifying marks. Hence Declared Technically responsive as per the requirement of RFP. (detailed evaluation sheets attached)
5. M/s AL-IMAM Enterprises	586	The technical proposal was evaluated as per the detailed eligibility and qualification criteria given in RFP. The proposal could not qualify to score min qualifying marks. Hence Declared Technically non-responsive as per the requirement of RFP. (detailed evaluation sheets attached)


11. Any other additional / supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share.

P-②

Project Director

(Detailed evaluation sheet attached as Annexure-A)

Signature: .....

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized 'G' followed by several vertical and diagonal strokes.

Official Stamp:

Project Director  
Sewerage & Sanitation for  
Gilgit City (Phase-II)

\*Standard Bidding Documents (SBD).



**TECHNICAL EVALUATION RESULTS**  
**DETAILED EVALUATION**

*(Annexure-A)*

Serial No.	Evaluation Areas/ Description	Max. Marks Allocated as per RFP	Name of participated Engineering Consulting Firms				
			M/s EMC (JV) M/s Wajedo International Corporation Pvt. Ltd	M/s EPCM in Association with PEPAC	M/s Umar Munshi Associates (UMA)	M/s NESPAK	M/s AL IMAM Enterprises
1.	Organizational Profile	50	(1/5) 34	(2/5) 25	(3/5) 44	(4/5) 47	(5/5) 29
2.	General Experience of Firm	50	00	50	50	50	50
3.	Specific/similar Experience of Firm	200	00	00	200	200	00
4.	Approach and Methodology and Work planning	300	190	215	227	245	228
5.	Financial Soundness	100	100	00	67	67	100
6.	Key Experts / Personnel	300	00	126	232.60	274	179
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>820.6</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>586</b>
	<b>Obtained Marks (%)</b>		<b>32.4%</b>	<b>41.6%</b>	<b>82.06%</b>	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>58.6%</b>
			Technically Non – Responsive	Technically Non – Responsive	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	Technically Non – Responsive

**PROJECT DIRECTOR**  
Sewerage and Sanitation System for Gilgit city

Project Director  
Sewerage & Sanitation for  
Gilgit City (Phase-II)

Serial No.	Name of participated Consulting Firms	Total Marks	Minimum Qualifying Marks	Obtained Marks	% Age	Remarks	Reasons / Justifications
1.	M/s EMC (JV) M/s Wajedo International Corporation Pvt. Ltd	1000	700	324	32.4	Technically Non - Responsive (could not obtained min. qualifying score)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No JV agreement submitted by the firm</li> <li>No data for the JV partner (WIC) is submitted i.e., PEC Registration, NTN Number, Company Profile, Projects Executed, Staff Strength etc.</li> <li>Most of the General projects are in progress. Only one (01) number of projects has been executed</li> <li>Both the firms do not have any specific / similar experience</li> <li>The Key Experts could not fulfill the required criteria</li> <li>The firm could neither secure 50% Marks in each category nor 70% overall marks</li> </ol>
2.	M/s EPCM in Association with PEPAC	1000	700	416	41.6	Technically Non - Responsive (could not obtained min. qualifying score)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm EPCM has less than fifteen (15) years of experience.</li> <li>The firm EPCM does not have the relevant Sewerage code for STPs.</li> <li>Both the firms do not have specific / similar experience</li> <li>Both the firms could not fulfil the required criteria of financial soundness as the financial turnover is less than 100 Million. The firm EPMC has not submitted any Audited Reports as well</li> <li>The firms have submitted performance guarantee amounting to 3.5 Million, instead of Call at deposit/ bank draft or Bank Guarantee, which is unacceptable</li> <li>The firm could neither secure 50% Marks in each category nor 70% overall marks</li> </ol>
3.	M/s Umar Munshi Associates	1000	700	820.60	82.06	Technically Responsive	The firm secured 50% Marks in each category and 70% overall Marks as well
4.	M/s NESPAK	1000	700	883	88.30	Technically Responsive	The firm secured 50% Marks in each category and 70% overall Marks as well
5.	M/s AL IMAM Enterprises	1000	700	586	58.6	Technically Non Responsive (could not obtained min. qualifying score)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The firm does not have the relevant Sewerage code for STPs</li> <li>The firm does not have specific / similar experience</li> <li>The firm could neither secure 50% Marks in each category nor 70% overall marks.</li> </ol>

Page 1/4

Project Director  
Sewerage & Sanitation for  
Gilgit City (Phase-II)