

## LAHORE GENERAL HOSPITAL, LAHORE

1. Grievance committee meeting was held on 17-03-2018, under the chairmanship of Prof. Dr. Muhammad Moin, Prof. of Ophthalmology to resolve the grievances submitted by the firms, for the purchase of medical equipment through ADP Scheme Rehabilitation of Phase-I & PINS Phase-III.

2. Following committee members attended the meeting:

Prof. Dr. Farhat Naz, Prof. of Gynae

Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi, Prof. of Medicine

Dr. Yawar Sajjad, Assistant Prof. Plastic Surgery

Dr. Qaiser Parveen, Private Member

Dr. Arif Shahzad Bhatti, Private Member

Dr. Syed Ali Natiq Mehdi Zaidi, EC/ Biomedical Engineer

3. The following items were discussed:-

Sr #	Name of Equipment	Name of Firm	Model/Make	Remarks	Decision
1	Anesthesia Machine with Ventilator Rehabilitation Phase-I	M/S Vertex Medical	PRIMUS & IAC C500 (Infinity M540 + Infinity C500 Medical Cockpit), AND Fabius Plus & Vista120S, Dragerwerk, Germany	<p>M/S Shirazi Trading presentation against M/S Vertex Medical:</p> <p><b>Monitoring:</b> It was noticed during the financial bid opening meeting in the presence of honorable committee, M/S Vertex Medical did not quoted separate price of Monitor as required in the Tender specifications of Anesthesia Workstation which was duly verified by Mr. Zia ul Haq Tahir (Technical Officer) therefore you are requested to reject deficient offer of M S Vertex Medical.</p> <p>The committee noted that lack of separate price of monitor was deficiency of their bid, therefore their bid is considered non responsive.</p> <p><b>Modular Vital Sign Monitor</b> The requirement of specificdaiton is Modular Vital Sign Monitor however M/S Vertex Medial quoted Model: Infinity Acute Care System Instead of Modular Vital Sign Monitor. Basically, Infinity M540 is a monitor which have screen size 6.4 inches which don't fulfill the requirement of 17 inches screen size as required in the tender specifications. However, they have quoted additional screen only model: infinity C500 which has 17 inches screen only. Therefore you are requested to reject deficient offer of M/S Vertex Medical.</p> <p>The committe found that M/S Vertex's quoted model fulfills the tender specifications. Therefore grievance of the firm is not accepted.</p>	<p>Grievance accepted, Non Responsive</p> <p>Grievance not accepted.</p>

Sr #	Name of Equipment	Name of Firm	Model/Make	Remarks	Decision
		M/S Shirazi Trading	Avance CS2 +B850 AND 9100C NXT +B40, GE Healthcare, USA	<p><b>Technical Deviation:</b> - B850 Monitor doesn't have Battery backup of at least 60 minutes.</p> <p><b>Grievance of the Firm</b> The online UPS is offered for the quoted Monitor as a Backup which is fulfilling the tender specifications requirement and smooth functioning of monitor further there was no demand of Built In battery back mentioned in the RFP. With reference to same PVMS specification's published in different tender of Institutes of Punjab Shirazi Trading Company is qualified in same quoted model.</p> <p>The committee after evaluating quoted model on practical demonstration found that lack of built-in battery backup is a critical and clinically significant deficiency and would lead to lack of adequate care of patients in Anesthesia workflow. The committee decided to up hold the decision of Technical Advisory Committee.</p>	Grievance not accepted.
<b>Since both manufacturers have been declared non responsive, committee decided that this item should be re tendered.</b>					
2	Neurosurgery Instruments	M/S Coral Medical	Medicon, Germany	<p><b>Grievance by the Firm:</b> Their technical offer declared non responsive with the remarks as "incomplete Quotation".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In pre bid meeting this was discussed that the specifications of Cloward Retractor system are specific to one manufacturer i.e. integra, especially since this is a non PV item. Suppliers objected on the issue and a note at the end of tender specifications added that "Minor deviation in size and shape &lt; 10% will be accepted".</li> <li>2. The basis of rejection of our bid is that blade sizes are not complete in an "OPTIONAL" item Cloward Retractor system, which our principal M/s Medicon Germany has confirmed in writing that they will manufacture the required blade sizes especially for this tender, even when the deviation was of minor nature.</li> <li>3. As the specific sizes of blades are only made by integra, even the lowest bidder on whom the order is being placed doesn't have the specific sizes of blades required in tender enquiry who has been unjustifiably technically qualified.</li> <li>4. Representation on the day opening of the financial offer dated 07.02.2018 in which your good office promised to constitute a redressal committee to reevaluate the bid.</li> <li>5. This minor deviation in our bid is basis of rejection of our bid. This shows a biased evaluation as the deficiency in our bid is the same deficiency in the lowest technically approved bidder.</li> <li>6. In view of above point 4 &amp; 5, this constitutes a gross injustice to us and a huge loss to the public exchequer funds.</li> </ol>	Grievance not accepted.

Sr #	Name of Equipment	Name of Firm	Model/Make	Remarks	Decision
				<p>7. To support the consortium working and loss to public exchequer we highlight that as per comparative statement (copy enclosed) of various tenders between the bidders of this tender in other institutions where the difference in the prices has never been over 10 to 15%. Supporting our contention of consortium the difference between accepted and rejected bidder is nearly 100%.</p> <p>8. item Cloward Retractor system is the only set in which our offer has a minor deviation and is rejected. As this is an Optional item (copy enclosed), this should not be the basis of rejection of our offer of other sets. The tender has been quoted with individual set prices as the working of other sets is not affected by the Cloward retractor system, each set should be purchased individually. In the light of above, the firm has requested to consider their bid.</p> <p>With reference earlier grievance committee meeting. Bids were reevaluated by technical committee. The end users found that quoted instruments of Coral Medical constituted incomplete set. Keeping this in mind committee decided to up hold the decision of Technical Advisory Committee.</p>	

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Moin, Prof. of Ophthalmology

Prof. Dr. Farhat Naz, Prof. of Gynae

Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi, Prof. of Medicine

Dr. Yawar Sajjad, Assistant Prof. Plastic Surgery

Dr. Qaiser Parveen, Private Member

Dr. Arif Shahzad Bhatti, Private Member

Dr. Syed Ali Natiq Mehdi Zaidi, EC/ Biomedical Engineer

