

**MINUTES OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14-01-2022 TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF SURGICAL / DISPOSIBLES AND MEDICAL DEVICES FOR THE YEAR 2021-22.**

A meeting of Grievance Committee to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Surgical / Disposables and Medical Devices for the year 2021-22 was held on 14-01-2022 in the office of the Chairman Grievance Committee Prof. Dr. Hanif Mian, Professor of Orthopedic, Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members attended the meeting;

1. Prof. Dr. Hanif Mian, Prof. of Orthopedic	<b>Chairman</b>
2. Prof. Dr. Khizer Hayat, Prof. of Urology	Member
3. Dr. Kashif Aziz, Associate Prof. of Medicine	Member
4. Dr. Sabtain, Senior consultant of Anesthetist	Member
5. Dr. Zeeshan Haider, AMS Implementation	Member
6. Dr. Arif Shehzad Bhatti	Member (Private)
7. Mrs. Sadia Rana Deputy Drug Controller LGH	Member

3. The proceeding of the meeting was commenced with the recitation from the Holy Quran.

4. The committee reviewed the pending cases and after briefed discussion and hearing the firm's representatives, the committee unanimously decided all the cases as under.

Sr. No	Grievance submitted by	TEC RESULT	Proceeding of Redressal of Grievance Committee / Decision
1	<p>M/s Anwar &amp; Sons submitted grievance bearing diary No.12742/LGH, Dated 23-12-2021. Company aggrieved that their bid was rejected due to rate visibility in financial bid even though it was properly sealed and packed. Firm requests to review the decision of rejection as other firms of medicine tenders area considered having the same objection and given a chance for healthy competition and in best interest of hospital.</p>	Non Responsive due to visibility of financial bid	<p>Mr. Khurram Shahzad (Area Sales Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Anwar and Sons to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of visibility of some rates through a properly sealed envelope of financial bid. This matter has also come forth during redressal of grievance of medicines and was discussed in detail in accordance to spirit of PPRA rules which demands sealed envelope. Since all the financial bids are securely placed under lock and key in front of TPC. So it does not affect any fair competition. After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice. Hence the grievance is accepted. (Same decision is taken for all such cases.)</p>
2	<p>M/s Accord Health Care submitted grievance bearing diary No.13058/LGH, Dated 29-12-2021. Firm states that the next day of tender opening meeting after submission of quoted samples to pharmacist office, got a call that their tender had been rejected due to financial proposal visibility. As per procurement rule, if there is any discrepancy in quotation it must be rejected in tender opening procedure by returning complete documents to firm at that time. Firm is requesting for justice.</p>	Non Responsive due to visibility of financial bid	<p>Mr. Nadeem Abbas (representative) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Accord Healthcare to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of visibility of some rates through a properly sealed envelope of financial bid. It was also directed to the representative to submit samples for evaluation purpose. After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice. Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>

3	<p>M/s SFS submitted grievance bearing diary No.13142/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm states that they were marked unresponsive due to rates visibility. However, their rates were not visible.</p> <p>Firm requests to consider their request to appear in front of Grievance Committee.</p>	Non Responsive due to visibility of financial bid	<p>Mr. Basit ( Institutional Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S SFS to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of visibility of some rates through a properly sealed envelope of financial bid.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>
4	<p>M/s Surgical Fibre submitted grievance bearing diary No.12841/LGH, Dated 24-12-2021.</p> <p>Company states that their tender document was rejected by technical advisory committee because it was sealed with stapler. They are requesting to ignore this minor mistake and reconsider them.</p>	Non Responsive as financial bid was sealed with stapler.	<p>Mr. Ahsan (owner) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Surgical Fibre. The representative was asked to describe their grievance. He claimed that the financial bid was in sealed envelope with stapler. This matter was evaluated and is concluded as these financial bids are securely placed under lock and key in front of TPC. So it does not affect any fair competition. However the bidder was directed to preferably put a taped seals in future.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>
5	<p>M/S Shamco submitted grievance bearing diary No.13196/LGH, Dated 31-12-2021.</p> <p>The firm is nonresponsive (T.E.#290 catheter lock solution) with the objection as the rates quoted in financial bid are visible. The firm requests to consider them in tender.</p>	Non Responsive due to visibility of financial bid	<p>Mr. Anwar (Sales Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Shamco to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of visibility of some rates through a properly sealed envelope of financial bid.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>

6	<p>M/s Finetex Cotton Industry bearing diary No.13065/LGH, Dated 29-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm stated that their tender got non-responsive on the basis of unsealed financial bid. It submitted that due to human error, corner of the financial envelope may be left opened/loose but did not impose any financial impact on the financial bid and the institution and requested to consider their Tender for the sake of healthy competition.</p>	<p>Firm was non responsive due to not properly sealed financial bid.</p>	<p>Mr. Naveed Iqbal (Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Finetax Cotton Industry to describe their grievance. He said that seal of financial bid was not proper from corner. This matter was thoroughly discussed in detail. Since all the financial bids are securely placed under lock and key in front of TPC. So it does not affect any fair competition. Although he was directed to be cautious in properly sealing of bids.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>
7	<p>M/s Wasiq Enterprises submitted grievance bearing diary No.19/LGH, Dated 01-01-2022.</p> <p>Company states that their tender was rejected due to less of CDR. They are submitting remaining less CDR.</p> <p>Company request to qualify the firm for the benefit of patient and hospital.</p>	<p>The amount of required CDR is less.</p>	<p>Mr. Aashiq (Sales Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Wasiq to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of their CDR less than 2%. The committee evaluated the matter and concluded that it's an absolute mandatory criteria and can't be over ruled.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>
8	<p>M/s MediCamp International submitted grievance bearing diary No.12991/LGH, Dated 28-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm requests to reconsider the decision as they were rejected due to bid security less than actual required due to typing error as follows;</p> <p>They mistakenly misread quantity of item at T.E no.. 109 as Qty:300pcs in bid instead of actual Qty:400pcs due to alike product at T.E no.108, guide wire with Qty 300pcs.</p> <p>Firm states that it was a mistake and not intentional.</p>	<p>The amount of required CDR is less.</p>	<p>Mr. M Sajid (Field Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Medicamp to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of their CDR (bid security) less than 2%. The committee evaluated the matter and concluded that it's an absolute mandatory criteria and can't be over ruled.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>

9	<p>M/s Meher Traders submitted grievance bearing diary No.12961/LGH, Dated 28-12-2021.</p> <p>Company states that they were rejected due to less 2% CDR in item no.144 which was a human error</p> <p>Firm is requesting to accept their grievance.</p>	<p>The amount of CDR is less than the required amount.</p>	<p>Mr. Naeem (institutional Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Meher Traders to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of their CDR (bid security) less than 2%. He claimed that an item at TE 144 was included mistakenly in technical bid so not to consider it. The committee evaluated the matter and concluded that it's an absolute mandatory criteria and can't be over ruled. Technical and financial bids can't be altercated.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>						
10	<p>M/S Safe Health Pakistan Bizcon submitted grievance bearing diary No.13162/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021.</p> <p>We M/S. Safe Health Pakistan Bizconquoted Seven items in tender. Among these items, one item at T.E. #89 Endotracheal Tube with Cuff all sizes, which was quoted by mistake. We request the authorities not to consider this article in Technical and Financial Bid Opening.</p>	<p>Firm non responsive due to submission of less 2% Bid security as per quoted items</p> <table><tr><td>Required</td><td>Submitted</td><td>Difference</td></tr><tr><td>293020</td><td>281500.00</td><td>-11520.00</td></tr></table>	Required	Submitted	Difference	293020	281500.00	-11520.00	<p>Mr. Faisal (Marketing Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Safe Health Pakistan to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of their CDR (bid security) less than 2%. The committee evaluated the matter and concluded that it's an absolute mandatory criteria and can't be over ruled.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>
Required	Submitted	Difference							
293020	281500.00	-11520.00							
11	<p>M/s Essity submitted grievance bearing diary No.12825/LGH, Dated 24-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm states that they had enclosed tender security deposit 2%.</p> <p>As per tender item TE# 31 (cast padding 4", 6" fine cotton cast padding) required with two different sizes on the same sr.no. with only given estimated cost Rs.65 and only total quantity of 1500 units. It seems that hospital required 4",6" total ;1500 units and there is not breakup of sizes and only mentioned one cost in same sr.no. so that is why we had made security as per given data.</p> <p>Firm is requesting to consider it.</p>	<p>Bid security is 2% CDR is typographically calculated.</p> <p>The firm have submitted accurate amount of CDR. The grievance may be accepted.</p>	<p>Mr. Malik Aashiq (Institutional Manager) attending the meeting on behalf of M/S Essity to describe their grievance about rejection on the basis of their CDR (bid security) less than 2%. The representative claimed that the amount of deposited CDR was not less. The matter is scrutinized by the committee. It is concluded that there is an error in calculation on part of procuring agency.</p> <p>After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance. It is also directed to Technical Evaluation Committee to evaluate the bid and samples in accordance to set criteria and to upload the result as per routine practice.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>						

12	M/S MEDI SERVE submitted grievance bearing diary No 13154./LGH, Dated 30-12-2021. Grievance against rejection of all quoted items as the reason of rejection is not mentioned clearly. It is requested that our rejection may kindly be undone and re-evaluate our bid documents.	T.E No 10,18,29,36,50,54,64,68,69,70,71,86,87,88,93,97,98,117,118,122,131,135,136,137,142,145,150,151,152,153,154,191,195,201	No one attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Mediserve. The committee evaluated the matter. After due deliberation the committee decided to uphold the decision of TEC. Hence grievance is rejected.	
13	M/s Medi-Serv International submitted grievance bearing diary No.12919/LGH, Dated 27-12-2021. Firm states that they have been non responsive for not submitting samples & poor quality. Firm claims that they have submitted all the samples and their products are in use with other govt. institutes. TE#67 disposable LMA all sizes nonresponsive due to SNP. TE#143 nebulizer set for ventilator was rejected by end user. Firm request for re-evaluation of sample.	TE# 67 we did not find sample TE#143 Rejected by end user (Poor mask fixation and poor oxygen connection fixation )	Mr. Fakhar Bashir (Institutional Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Mediserve International. The representative described the grievance about TEC result for items at TE67 and 143. He also presented the sample submission receipt for TE 67. The committee thoroughly scrutinized the receipt and sample evaluation report. The bidder is directed to submit this sample (TE 67) again for evaluation. Final decision of TE 67 will be taken after evaluation report of end user.	This sample is declared rejected in evaluation by end user (copy attached). The committee endorsed the results and declared bid non-responsive for TE 67. After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence the grievance is rejected.

14	M/s Kohinoor Industries submitted grievance bearing diary No.13104/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021. Firm states that their product with sr.no.48 (cotton bandage BPC roll 6.5cm*6m) was declared non responsive due to difference in drug registration. The reason of difference is that our product registration is old since 1980 and after that DRAP issued a notification to change size of bandage in 2006 .also has applied for item registration in DRAP dated 06-01-2020.Firm is qualified for this product in LGH and supplying the same (All copies attached). Firm is requesting to consider their grievance.	As per T.E 48 item was Non Responsive (drug registration specifications are different)	Mr. Ramzan (Regional Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Kohinoor Industries. The representative described the grievance in detail. The committee thoroughly evaluated the matter by checking documents in bid and decided to accept their stance. It is also directed to send said sample for evaluation from end user	Upon receiving of evaluation report of sample at TE 48 as approved, the committee endorsed these results. After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to declare the item at TE 48 as RESPONSIVE. Hence the grievance is accepted.
15	M/s Sadqain health care submitted grievance bearing diary No.13188/LGH, Dated 31-12-2021.Grievance against item TE#130 that has been rejected due to blunt needle. It states that LMA has no needle which declared blunt. Might be some typing error. Firm is requesting to consider their bid responsive.	AS per TAC T.E No. 130 Non Responsive Rejected by end user (blunt needle )	Mr. Umer Rathore (SPS) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Sadqain Healthcare. The representative asked to describe his grievance in detail. The committee evaluated the case and it is revealed that there was a typographical error. In fact the item at TE 130 is responsive. After due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance and declared TE 130 responsive.	
16	M/s Sadqain Health Care submitted grievance bearing diary No.13186/LGH, Dated 31-12-2021. Grievance against TE#5. Firm states that LGH has accepted bid of company which do not have one year experience after DRAP registration but they are registered and have required experience. Firm is requesting to consider bids of only registered firms.	Bid is responsive for TE 05.	Mr. Umer Rathore (SPS) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Sadqain Healthcare to describe his grievance against other responsive company for TE 5 (Disposable Airways). The grievance committee looked into this matter and the representative was told about SRO 526(1)/2021 dated 30.04.21 issued by DRAP regarding exemption period for registration. After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence grievance is rejected.	

17	M/S Sadqain Health Care submitted grievance bearing diary No13187/LGH, dated 31-12-2021 against TE# 139, 140, 141. Firm states that LGH has accepted bids of company which has not one year experience after DRAP registration as per clause no.6 of tender. We are registered and have the required experience. Firm is requesting to consider the bids of only registered firms.		Mr. Umer Rathore (SPS) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Sadqain Healthcare to describe his grievance against other responsive company for TE 139, 140 and 141 (Nasal Prongs). The grievance committee looked into this matter and the representative was told about SRO 526(1)/2021 dated 30.04.21 issued by DRAP regarding exemption period for registration. After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence grievance is rejected.																							
18	M/s K.S. Agencies submitted grievance bearing diary No.13000/LGH, Dated 28-12-2021. Grievance for item T.E.no.22, 38, 39,40,174,175,176 ,180,183,184,187,248. Firm claims that their factory, Huaiyin medical instruments is one of the largest suture manufacturers in the world using raw material from European sources. Our sutures have been used extensively in LGH over the past 20 years as well accepted in almost all institutes in Pakistan. And ERCP guide wire is manufactured by Microtech which is one of largest manufacturers in the world. Its products are FDA, CE, TUV, CFDA, GMP, & ISO approved and are being used in all leading Hospitals and by all leading Surgeons with complete satisfaction Firm is requesting to re-evaluate their samples.	<p>AS per TEC result</p> <table><tr><td>38</td><td>Non Responsive rejected by end user (less quality strength)</td></tr><tr><td>39</td><td>Non Responsive rejected by end user (less strength)</td></tr><tr><td>40</td><td>Non- Responsive (Out of specification)</td></tr><tr><td>174</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)</td></tr><tr><td>175</td><td>Non- Responsive (Out of specification)</td></tr><tr><td>176</td><td>Non- Responsive (Out of specification)</td></tr><tr><td>180</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)</td></tr><tr><td>183</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)</td></tr><tr><td>184</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)</td></tr><tr><td>187</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Poor Quality)</td></tr><tr><td>248</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user</td></tr></table>	38	Non Responsive rejected by end user (less quality strength)	39	Non Responsive rejected by end user (less strength)	40	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)	174	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)	175	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)	176	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)	180	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)	183	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)	184	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)	187	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Poor Quality)	248	Non Responsive Rejected by end user	Mr. Muzzamil (Sales Manager) accompanied with Mr. Zubair Rana (Distributor) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S K.S. Agencies to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. It is decided to re-evaluate the samples at TE 38, 39, 174, 180, 183, 184 and 187. The final decision will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user. However items at TE 40, 175, 176 are not as per advertised tender specifications so will remain non responsive.	The re-evaluated samples are declared not-satisfactory in evaluation report by end user (copy attached). After due deliberation committee unanimously endorsed the TEC results and UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence the grievance is rejected.
38	Non Responsive rejected by end user (less quality strength)																									
39	Non Responsive rejected by end user (less strength)																									
40	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)																									
174	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)																									
175	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)																									
176	Non- Responsive (Out of specification)																									
180	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)																									
183	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)																									
184	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Needle not appropriate)																									
187	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Poor Quality)																									
248	Non Responsive Rejected by end user																									



19	<p>M/s Allmed Solutions submitted grievance bearing diary No.12903/LGH, Dated 27-12-2021. Grievance for T.E 81 DJ stents</p> <p>Evaluation report Non responsive due to sample not provided. Company requests for correction of technical evaluation as the samples were attached and received by the pharmacists of hospital. Grievance for +0 PCN set.</p> <p>Evaluation report Non responsive due to registration and experience not attached. Company claims that their products are submitted for registration in DRAP and they will submit copy to LGH management once DRAP issue registration letter.</p>	<p>TE# 81 we did not find sample TE# 162 for this class of item registration is required. Only registered products can be purchased. The firm has applied for class B. Registration not in class D.</p>	<p>Mr. Kamran (Senior Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Allmed Solutions. The representative described the grievance regarding TEC result at TE 162 and also presented sample receipt for TE 81. The committee scrutinized the matter to conclude the grievance.</p> <p>It was directed for re sampling of item at TE 81 and to evaluate both samples at TE 81 and 162 from end user as exemption period from registration shall prevail for period given in (SRO 526(1)/2021).</p>	<p>Technical evaluation committee submitted its evaluation report declaring items at TE 81 and 162 as responsive.</p> <p>After due deliberation and detailed discussion, grievance committee unanimously endorsed the end user's report. Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>
20	<p>M/s Bajwa Sons submitted grievance bearing diary No.12994/LGH, Dated 28-12-2021. Firm states that their surgical sutures were rejected by end-user due to needle not appropriate or thread not smooth, Firm claims that their foreign Principal Yancheng huida is a renowned manufacturer and is importing sutures and needle material from Germany &amp; South Korea. and are supplying sutures to major hospitals of Pakistan. the firm claims that they maintain large inventories of sutures also.</p> <p>The firm requested to examine the clinically quality of sutures and th</p> <p>Firm is requesting to consider their products.</p>	<p>The sutures of bidder M/S bajwa Sons are rejected by end user due to needle not appropriate or thread not smooth and some are rejected due to short experience in market.</p>	<p>Mr. Zahid (Regional Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Bajwa to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. It is decided to re-evaluate the samples like other bidders of various sutures. The final decision will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user.</p>	<p>The committee received the end user re-evaluation report with not satisfactory results. (copy attached)</p> <p>After due deliberation, the grievance committee unanimously endorsed the above said report and declare the bid non responsive for all quoted items. Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>

21	M/s Rafi Sultan Enterprises submitted grievance bearing diary No.13098/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021. Grievance T.E.no. 204. Firm is requesting to review the approval of M/s. B.Braun as they quoted its carbon steel blades instead of carbon coated steel and declared responsive. Firm states the advantages of carbon coated steel blades over steel blades.	The sample of sterile surgical blade is of M/s B.Braun TE# 204 is responsive by end user.	Mr. Umer Rathore (Senior Product Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Rafi Sultan Enterprises. The representative described his grievance against B Braun for the item at TE 204. The committee scrutinized both samples and labels which were shown as carbon steel blades. After due deliberation and detail discussion, the grievance company unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is rejected.	
22	M/s Global Marketing Services submitted grievance bearing diary No.13172/LGH, Dated 31-12-2021. Grievance against non-responsiveness for TE# 309, 311 for sample not provided and T.E no. 314 & 322 and 335 rejected by end-user. Firm is requesting to re-evaluate the samples as end user asked to re submit samples.	We did not find samples of 309, 311 T.E no. 314 & 322 and 335 are rejected by end user of neuro angiography.	Mr. Waris (Business Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Global Marketing Services. The representative was asked to describe his grievance. He claimed that sample of item at TE 309 was submitted along with bid. The committee evaluated the whole matter in detail and directed to resample and re-evaluation of sample at 309. However it was unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence the grievance is rejected for items at TE 311, 314, 322 and 335.	The bidder failed to submit sample of TE 309 so it could not be evaluated. After due deliberation, the committee is decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence the grievance is rejected.

23	<p>M/S Hashir Surgical Services submitted grievance bearing diary No.13190/LGH, Dated 31-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm submitted that we have been prequalified by the DGHS Punjab and MCC KPK for the year last many years and are supplying product in all over KPK and Punjab without any single complaint on the quality of our product (attached all purchase orders. Our competitor which is being declared single responsive has less quality as that of Ours. It is requested to review your decision and reevaluate our samples and declared our firm as responsive.</p>	<p>AS per TAC;</p> <table><tr><td>100</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Improper fitting on face)</td></tr><tr><td>103</td><td>Non-Responsive (not offered all sizes)</td></tr><tr><td>129</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user(blunt needle )</td></tr><tr><td>133</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user(Very soft tubing )</td></tr><tr><td>204</td><td>Non Responsive Rejected by end user</td></tr></table>	100	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Improper fitting on face)	103	Non-Responsive (not offered all sizes)	129	Non Responsive Rejected by end user(blunt needle )	133	Non Responsive Rejected by end user(Very soft tubing )	204	Non Responsive Rejected by end user	<p>Mr. M. Tahir (Institutional Manger) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Hashir Surgicals to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. The samples were rejected by end users due to various reasons. After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected.</p>	
100	Non Responsive Rejected by end user (Improper fitting on face)													
103	Non-Responsive (not offered all sizes)													
129	Non Responsive Rejected by end user(blunt needle )													
133	Non Responsive Rejected by end user(Very soft tubing )													
204	Non Responsive Rejected by end user													
24	<p>M/s B.Braun sharing expertise submitted grievance bearing diary No.12800/LGH, Dated 24-12-2021.</p> <p>Firm stated that; Our surgical sutures are rejected by end user. Company claims that it is a multinational company and is a pioneer in the field of sutures which strictly complies with BPC/USP standards. Their sutures have been evaluated by Punjab health department and are in regular use in LSH from last 2-3 years and other major health institutes of Pakistan.</p> <p>Firm is requesting to re-evaluate their surgical sutures.</p>	<p>The sutures of M/S are rejected by end user with comments of as Needle not appropriate</p>	<p>Mr Asif Mahmood attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S B Braun to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. It is decided to re-evaluate the samples of sutures at TE 174 to 177 and TE 181 to 184. The final decision will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user.</p>	<p>The committee received re-evaluation report from TEC declaring all surgical sutures as RESPONSIVE. After due deliberation, the grievance redressal committee unanimously decided to endorse these results and declared items at TE 174,175,176,177,181,182,183 and 184 as RESPOSIVE.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is accepted.</p>										

25	<p>M/s Irteqa biotek submitted grievance bearing diary No.13057/LGH, Dated 29-12-2021. Firm states that their item was rejected because it does not match item quoted in tender and that their quoted product is being used in LGH for past 3 years. Troponin is used for testing myocardial infarction. Firm is requesting to look into this matter.</p>	<p>TE #299 the item was rejected because published specifications was Troponin. T kit and bidder quoted Troponin I so, declared out of specification. The item was published wrongly as Troponin I kit instead of Trponin T kit</p>	<p>Mr. Arsalan (Area Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Irteqa biotek. The representative described the grievance in detail about Troponin I and Troponin T specifications. The grievance committee scrutinized the matter and concluded that advertised and quoted specifications are different. This case should be resolved before tender opening or even in evaluation stage. However at this stage, specifications can't be altered. It is, though, directed to change the specifications with the written consent of concerning department in re-tender advertisement. After due deliberation, the grievance redressal committee unanimously UPHOLD the decision of TEC. Hence the grievance is REJECTED.</p>
26	<p>M/S Ali Gohar &amp; Company submitted grievance bearing diary No.12816/LGH, Dated 24-12-2021. Firm requests to consider items at T.E# 8- Armound Tubes , T.E.# 89- Endotracheal Tube with Cuff , T.E.#224- Tracheostomy Tube with Cuff under SRO 526(1) 2021 of DRAP and exempt the objection of registration. These Products are not fall in class D, or lifesaving medical devices as mentioned in SRO notification for the mandatory registration. Kindly review and consider these products responsive.</p>	<p>As per TAC T.E No. 8, 89 &amp; 224, non-responsive due to Not Registered and not applied for registration</p>	<p>Mr. Naeem Ahmad (Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S AG &amp; Company to describe their grievance. The representative also presented the copy of SRO. 526 (1)2021 of DRAP enlisting exemption periods from registration. The Committee scrutinized the matter for final conclusion. It is decided to re-evaluate the items at TE 89 and 224. On same stance sample of item at TE 89 of M/s Hospicare System is also sent for revaluation by end user. The final decision for these will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user.</p> <p>Upon receiving the evaluation report of samples at 89 and 224 which stated satisfactory results, the committee unanimously endorsed the report. TE 89 of M/s Hospicare is also declared RESPONSIVE. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the grievance committee declared samples at TE 89 and 224 as RESPONSIVE. However it is decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC for item at TE 08. Hence grievance is accepted for TE 89 and 224 and rejected for TE 08.</p>

27	<p>M/s Cardiac Care bearing diary No.13071/LGH, Dated 29-12-2021. Firm is requesting to reconsider their products as their items are being used in different hospitals without any complaint and available in the market for so many years; Detail of under grievance items is as under; T.E. 27 Bougie, 36 Chest Electrode, 55 CVP Line Adult, 166 PICC Line with Guide wire, 167 PICC line with short length&amp; T.E No.195 Redevic bottle with drain.</p>	<p>T.E 27 Non- Responsive Rejected by end user (very soft material). T.E 166 Rejected by end user (blunt dilator, wire knocking). T.E 167 Rejected by end user T.E 36 and T.E 195 Non Responsive (Experience not sufficient) T.E 55 Non- Responsive (Out of spec.)</p>	<p>Mr. Murtaza (Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Cardiac Care. The representative was asked to explain his grievance. The committee evaluated the matter by checking documents in bid and evaluation report to device final conclusion. It is revealed that item at TE 36 qualifies the experience clause. So it is declared RESPONSIVE After due deliberation and detail discussion, the grievance redressal committee unanimously decided to uphold the decision of TEC for TE 27, 166, 167, 195 and 55. Hence grievance is rejected for TE 27, 166, 167, 195 and 55 and accepted for TE 36.</p>
28	<p>M/s Progressive Corporation submitted grievance bearing diary No.13072/LGH, Dated 29-12-2021. Firm is stating that the quoted size was 1.8m<sup>2</sup> while they were being rejected on 1.5m<sup>2</sup>. Firm is requesting to re-evaluate the actual size.</p>	<p>Non-Responsive Rejected by end user (1.5 surface area)</p>	<p>Mr. Anas (Director) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Progressive Corporation to describe their grievance. He explained the matter in detail regarding the quoted surface area of sample at TE 115 (Hollow fiber Dialyzer) which he claimed to be 1.8 m<sup>2</sup> rather 1.5m<sup>2</sup>. The Committee decided to verify the sample again to resolve this issue amicably. Final decision for these will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user.</p> <p>Re-verification report concluded that sample complies the advertised specifications 1.8 m<sup>2</sup>. After due deliberation the grievance redressal committee declared the item at TE 115 as RESPONSIVE. Hence grievance is ACCEPTED.</p>

29	<p>M/s Usmanco International submitted grievance bearing diary No.13144/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021. Grievance against;</p> <p>Item no.72 (disposable syringes 10ml) considered non responsive due to loose suction problem. Firm claims that the product is certified by EN ISO and FDA and is of standard quality.</p> <p>Item no.77 &amp; 79 (auto disable syringes 3ml &amp; 5ml) considered non responsive due to no leur lock. Firm claims that product have WHO PQS certification means t the specification is was standardized by WHO parameters of leur lock.</p> <p>Item no. 89 &amp; 90 (endotracheal tube cuffed &amp;uncuffed all sizes) non responsive due to poor inflation &amp; knacking. The bidder claims that their product is deliberately designed for ideal anatomical designed for ideal antomical condition with appropriate degree of hardness which nsure non kink able condition with proper inflation.</p> <p>Item no.124,125,126,127. Firm claims that their product is made up of third generation FEP catheter which is more flexiible kick resistant and transparent which ensure no resistance in drug flow</p>	<p>Item no.72 The item is Rejected by end user with comments of Loose Suction problem.</p> <p>Item no.77 &amp; 79 The item is Rejected by end user with comments of no leur lock</p> <p>Item no. 89 The item is Rejected by end user with comments poor inflation,knacking</p> <p>Item no.90 the bidder All sizes not offered by bidder</p>	<p>Syed Iftikhar Ahamad (Regional Institutional Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Usman Co International to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. The sample was rejected by end users due to non-compliance various quality parameters.</p> <p>After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected</p>
30	<p>M/s Amson vaccines &amp;Pharma submitted grievance bearing diary No.13/LGH, Dated 01-01-2022.</p> <p>Grievance against TE# 60,72. Company states that their products were declared non responsive and rejected by end user.</p> <p>Apple K1 1 ml syringe rejected due to poor quality vial, blunt dilator, wire knacking and Apple disposable syringe 10ml rejected due to problem in suction while 5ml syringe of same brand is accepted by the end user. Company claims that they are manufactured on the state of art manufacturing plant and gone through QC tests.</p> <p>Firm is requesting to reconsider and re-evaluate their syringes as they have been supplying syringes in different hospitals.</p>	<p>TE# 60 this item was rejected by end user with comments poor quality wire, blunt dilation, knacking</p> <p>TE#72 this item was rejected by end user with comments of Suction problem</p>	<p>Mr. M. Aqeel Nasir (Institution Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Amson Vaccine and Pharma (pvt.) Ltd. to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. The sample was rejected by end users due to non- compliance various quality parameters.</p> <p>After detailed discussion and due deliberation, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC.</p> <p>Hence the grievance is rejected</p>

31	<p>M/s Sind Medical Stores submitted grievance bearing diary No.13114/LGH, Dated 30-12-2021. Firm states that their products manufactured by Demetech Corporation have been rejected due to poor quality against TE#174,175,176,177,180,181,182,183,184. Firm claims that Demetech sutures are US-FDA approved, strictly following USP standards, pre-qualified by DG health Punjab and is supplied without any complaint across the Pakistan and is requesting to reconsider the decision.</p>	<p>TE#174,175,176,177,180,181,182,183, 184 were rejected by the End user with the remarks “Needle not appropriate”</p>	<p>Mr. Arsalan Saifee (Sales Promotion Officer) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Sindh Medical Stores to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. It is decided to re-evaluate the items at TE 174 to 177 and TE 180 to 184. The final decision for these will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user.</p>	<p>The grievance redressal committee received the re-evaluation report from end users (copy attached) declaring samples as approved. The report is endorsed by the grievance committee. After due deliberation, the grievance redressal committee unanimously declared bid of M/S Sind Medical Stores as RESPONSIVE for TE 174,175,176,177,180,181,182,183,184. Hence the grievance is ACCEPTED.</p>
32	<p>M/s Karim Industries submitted grievance bearing diary No.12933/LGH, Dated 28-12-2021. We M/s. Karim Industries, manufacturing and supplying high quality dressings at affordable rates to Health Departments of Govt. of Punjab, Sindh, KPK since many years. No Samples have been reported substandard till to date. We are Suppling Plaster of Paris of Standard Quality 15cm x 2.7m into your hospital. So how it is possible that our products having poor quality. (T.E. No.16,31,51,52) You are requested to please re-evaluate our Samples and take decision on justified grounds.</p>	<p>T.E 16, 31, 51, 52 were non responsive as these items were rejected by End User</p>	<p>Mr. Muhammad Tayyab (Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/ S Karim Industries to describe their grievance. The Committee evaluated the matter in detail to furnish the recommendations. It is decided to re-evaluate the items at TE 16, 51 and 52. The final decision for these will be taken after sample evaluation report from end user. However it is decided to UPHOLD the decision of TEC for items TE 16 and 31.</p>	<p>Upon receiving the re-evaluation result from end user, which declared the samples as approved. (Copy attached), the grievance committee endorsed these results and declared bid RESPONSIVE for TE 16, 51 &amp; 52. Hence the grievance is accepted for TE 16, 51 &amp; 52 and rejected for TE 31.</p>

**-SD-**