MINUTES OF MEETING OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICAL DEVICES / SURGICAL DISPOSABLE ITEMS FOR THE YEAR 2024-25.
Dated: 10.08.2024

A meeting of Grievance Committee to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medical Devices /Surgical disposable Items for the year 2024-25 was held on 10.08.2024 in the office of Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi, Professor of Medicine/ Chairman Grievance Committee Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members attended the meeting;

1. Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi, Prof. of Medicine — Chairperson
2. Prof. Dr. Khizer Hayat, Prof. of Urology — Member
3. Prof. Dr. Faheem Afzal Prof. of Pediatrics — Member
4. Dr. Ghias-ul-Hassan, Assistant Prof. of Gastroenterology — Member
5. Mr. Muhammad Ali, Biomedical Engineer/ Technical Officer LGH, Lahore — Member
6. Following firms submitted grievances;

Sr.No	Name of Firms	Sr.No	Name of Firms
1	M/s UDL Distribution	**5**	M/s Kaumedex
2	M/s Sadqain	**6**	M/s Intra Health
3	M/s Iqbal & Company	**7**	M/s The Searle Company
4	M/s Techzone	**8**	M/s Mubarak Visions.

KEY:

GRC	Grievance Redressal Committee	LOA	Letter of Authorization
TEC	Technical Evaluation Committee	FSC	Free Sale Certificate
DRAP	Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan	GMP	Good Manufacturing Practices
DRC	Drug Registration Certificate	DML	Drug Manufacturing License

The committee after briefed discussion and hearing the firm's representatives unanimously decided the grievances as under;

Sr. No	Grievance submitted by	TEC Result	Grievance Committee Decision
1	**M/s UDL Distribution (private) Ltd** submitted grievance vide letter No.6859/LGH, Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; *"M/S UDL Distribution Pvt LTD presented reservation as follows.* ➢ ***Grievance against M/S Arfi International Sr # 60*** *Double*	**M/s UDL Distribution Pvt Ltd** **T.E#60** *Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter (Responsive)*	Mr. Aamir (Regional Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S UDL Distributors to explain the grievance against various firms.

	*Lumen 12Fr Catheter **M/S Arfi International** quoted **ABLE** brand from CHINA, which do not fulfilled the Clause no 6 of evaluation Criteria "that their product has no experience".* ➢ ***Product's Experience** Supply of the quoted product in Government/ Semi Government/ private / public sector's institutions. (The bidder shall provide verifiable documentary evidences like commercial invoices /award letters/ purchase orders / delivery challan.* *Moreover, their quoted sample's Manufacturer name (Guangdong Baihe Medical Technology Co., Ltd) is different with DRAP registration (Guangdong Baine Medical Technology Co, Ltd.). According to bidding documents evaluation criteria clauses no. 10* *M/s. Arfi International should be non-responsive.* ➢ ***Grievance against M/s. Allmed Solutions Sr # 60** Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter The firm is aggrieved that that **M/S Allmed Solutions** quoted **Amecath** brand from Egypt only quoted 15 cm and don't have any experience in other sizes according to offered specification. In this regard firm is asking to make sure that reconcile with quoted sample and offered specifications.* ➢ ***Grievance against M/s. Hope Pharma Sr # 60** Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter* *M/S. Hope Pharma mentioned the brand name **Stream** from USA, which does not exist anywhere in USA. But the sample provided is MEDADIV brand so on the basis of **Clause 10** they must be disqualified.* *Moreover they don't have product experience as per **Clause 6** of evaluation criteria. They didn't mention the complete offered specification in their technical offer Therefore, they should be deemed non-responsive based on the aforementioned grounds.* • *In addition, it is to inform you that as per Medical Device Rule 2017 **TE No.60** is class D Product and must be registered in given class D. M/s. Allmed Solution and M/s. Hope Pharma both their quoted products registered in Class B.(reference attached)* ➢ ***Grievance against M/s. Iqbal & Company** Sr. # 60 Double*	**M/s Arfi International** **T.E#60** *Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter (Responsive)* **M/s Allmed Solution** **T.E #60** *Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter (Responsive)* **M/s Hope Pharma** T.E#60 *Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter(Responsive)* ***M/s Iqbal & Company*** *T.E#60 Double Lumen 12Fr Catheter (Non Responsive (FSC not Valid) Rejected by End User (syringe ,Knife,Sheet are Missing)* ***M/s UDL Distribution Pvt Ltd*** *T.E#72 Foly Catheter two Way (Responsive)* ***M/s Meher Trader*** *T.E#72 Foly Catheter two Way (Responsive)*	The representative showed reservations against technical evaluation results of various participating firms mainly for their quoted item @ T.E 60 i.e Double Lumen 12 FR Catheter over multiple issues such as: requisite experience; difference in offered & advertised specifications, brands, country of origin, manufacturing addresses on the sample and registration certificate and class of DRAP registration. The Committee scrutinized the matters from documents in the bid, advertised specifications and evaluation reports etc. for devising final conclusions. The matter against M/S Arfi International is evaluated and is found that requisite experience as per evaluation criteria is attached in the bid. The representative showed reservations regarding DRAP registration class of item at T.E 60 of some firms. It is concluded that DRUG REGULATORY AUTHORITY OF PAKISTAN is the one and same regulatory body which defined these classes and issued registration to medical devices. The grievance against M/S Hope is addressed in detail and is found that their quoted brand in technical offer and on label of sample differs from registered brand. Moreover it also lacks in required experience of quoted brand and size. As far as grievance of various sizes at <u>*T.E 60 (Double Lumen 12 FR Catheter)*</u> is concerned, the matter is explained as follows: total advertised quantity (*for all the mentioned three sizes*) is **3000**. Although in advertisement required quantities for two sizes i.e 13cm and 16 cm are mentioned as **1500** & **500** respectively but

	Lumen 12Fr Catheter M/s. Iqbal & Company sample of quoted product's manufacturing address is Mexico that didn't match with DRAP registration. ➢ ***Grievance against M/S Meher Trader*** *Sr #72 Foley Catheter two Way M/S Meher Trader quoted brand Wellmed from China, the firm has following reservation against this company* *In prequalification of Primary and Secondary tender 24-25 their firm disqualify on the following basis* *1. CE Certificate not verified (reference attached.)* *2. ISO Certificate not verified from issuing authority (reference attached.)* *As per bidding documents evaluation criteria of Compulsory parameters clause 12 M/s. Meher Traders should be non-responsive."*		against 15 cm, requisite quota is not printed. However it is understandable that "**remaining**" quantity is **1000** and should be considered for the later one. These quantities are advertised as per demand of end users (Nephrology/ Urology Departments). Albeit ideal situation would be to advertise three sizes against separate tender enquiry numbers however this is an essential item for critically ailing patients and any delay can bring challenges to cater demand. Since no single bidder quoted all three sizes so it is directed to consider these as sub parts a, b and c to proceed accordingly after financial bid opening. Their grievance against M/S Iqbal & Company is evaluated and is found that country of manufacture is same on technical offer and DRAP registration certificate i.e USA but differs on the sample i.e Mexico (*whereas this manufacturing site is not mentioned on DRC*). Moreover brand name of this product on US-FDA (free sale certificate), is "*Duo-Flow Side x Side"* which does not match on the sample (i.e Double Lumen Catheter Set) as well as brand name on technical offer is mentioned as "Medcomp." So it is a deviation of parameter at serial no. 13(1) (*valid free sale certificate bearing brand name of product freely available in the country of manufacturer*) and serial No. 10 of evaluation criteria. Furthermore end users rejected this quoted product for its efficient use. The aggrieved firm also challenged the quality certificates CE of M/S Meher traders for their quoted brand at T.E 72 Foley Catheter (Two Way). Upon scrutiny it (certificate) is found that manufacturing addresses on their quality, free sale and registration certificates, is different. Although the representative presented an application to DRAP for change of addresses but submission date is not before tender opening date. So it

			is not acceptable. After due deliberation and detail discussion, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S Hope and M/S Meher Traders as Non Responsive for item at T.E 60 and TE 72 respectively. M/S Iqbal & Company is already been rejected at TE 60 by T.E.C. Hence this grievance is **ACCEPTED** against said firms**.** However the committee further decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C for M/S Arfi International and M/S Allmed Solution. Hence grievance against above stated firms is **REJECTED**.
2	**M/s Sadqain Health care** submitted grievance vide letter No.6900/LGH & No.6900/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; The firms is saying that *"Reference uploaded Technical Evaluation Report of Medical Devices/ Surgical disposable Items for the year 2024-2025, we are aggrieved against the approval of following two firms:* *(1)4A International (E- medical Trach humid)* *(2) Popular International Pvt. Ltd (Shiley)* ***4A International** cited brand name, E-medcial Trach Humid, is not included in their Free Scale Certificate. Please re check their FSC to be sure. With regard to **Popular International** PVT LTD. We suspect that the brand name Shiley mentioned in the report is not listed on their certificate of DRAP registration and also not included in their Free Sale Certificate, which is also questionable due to manufacturer name mentioned "Covidien Medtronic USA". Although, they have used a different brand name. Please re check their FSC and DRAP registration certificate to be sure. Additionally, examine the Shiley samples again, as we have seen that they do not conform to the specified T-shape. It appears that neither 4A International nor Popular International Pvt. Ltd. has ever used these items at your institute previously. Please check their experience using your resources.*	**M/s Sadqain Health Care** T.E#17 BIPAP Gel Mask Set (Non Responsive) (Experience not attached (Not Registered) **M/s Sadqain Health Care** T.E#174 T Filter for Tracheostomy (Responsive) **M/s 4A International** T.E#174 T Filter for Tracheostomy (Responsive) **M/s Popular International** T.E#174 T Filter for Tracheostomy (Responsive)	Mr. Aamir (Product Specailist) attended the meeting on behalf of **M/S Sadqain Health Care** to explain the grievance against M/S Popular International and M/S 4-A International. The representative showed reservations against technical evaluation results of said participating firms for their quoted item @ T.E 174 (Filter for Tracheostomy) over multiple issues such as difference in the brand name on technical offer & registration certificate and free sale certificate. The matter is scrutinized by checking documents to conclude it. In case of 4 A International, Brand Name of quoted item at TE 174 in technical offer is not mentioned on free sale certificate as well as it varies from the brand name on the provided sample. For the grievance against M/S Popular International, It is revealed that T Filter for Tracheostomy is class B product and is still under exemption period from registration up

	Reconsider the TE # 174 T- Filter ruling regarding tracheostomy. We are sure that the institute and its patients will benefit most from our ongoing collaboration *Reference uploaded Technical Evaluation Report of Medical Devices/ Surgical disposable Items for the year 2024-2025, due to insufficient experience, our Bipap Mask TE# 17 was deemed non-responsive and eliminated from consideration in the Technical Evaluation Report under consideration.* *They apologize for not attaching a P.O in the first place, which prompted your institute to make this choice. For your information, experience documents have now been submitted and are attached to this grievance letter.* *They trust that any confusion about the missing document has been resolved. In light of the fact that our company's goods meet quality standards and that their commercial cooperation will continue, kindly examine the TE # 17 Bi-pap Mask decision"*		till 31.12.2024. However the samples provided by the firm bears brand name DAR which is different than on technical offer. This is not acceptable. The representative also urged to present documents regarding experience of their own quoted item at TE 17. It is affirmatively conveyed that documents cannot be accepted at this stage. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, it is unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C for their own quoted item at TE 17. So this grievance is **REJECTED**. It is also directed to declare bids of M/S Popular International and M/S 4A International as **Non Responsive** for T.E 174. Hence their grievance against these firms is **ACCEPTED**.
3	**M/s Iqbal & Company** submitted grievance vide letter No.6864/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; ***T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Triple Lumen with wire 7Fr*** *The Firm have attached valid free sales certificate in your bid, for your kind perusal they have attached once again. You are requested to review and accept their grievance and declare us responsive.* ***T.E#60)*** *FRC is valid as explained above* *2) Syringe is available as standard part of double lumen.* *3) Knife and sheath not required or mentioned in your bidding documents and we are fulling compiling to the published specification.* *4) However, we can offer same items knife and sheet FOC if approved.* *As per PPRA rule and your own bidding documents you will evaluate according to the advertised PPRA specs. Clarification attached)* *5) In previous years we have been approved but cannot win due to high prices. they are supplying same products in all teaching institutes even in all Pakistan they would like to request you to approve their products so that the hospital can get true benefits of tender. We request for re-evaluation and approval of their product as they are complying to the*	**M/s Iqbal & Company** T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Non Responsive (FSC not Valid) **M/s Flowtronix** T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Non Responsive Rejected by end user (guide wire quality not up to mark , kinking Dilator tip blunt , Deformed during Insertion) **M/s Cardiac Care** T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Non Responsive Rejected by end User (Not	Mr. Tariq (Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Iqbal & Company to explain the grievances against various firms on multiple items and also upon TEC result on their own quoted item (TE 41). The GRC scrutinized these matters to find their genuineness. The provided FDA (Free sale) certificate (for TE 41) attached in the bid of aggrieved firm is scrutinized for their make and model of the quoted item in technical offer. Brand name of said item on US FDA is "Multi-Cath Infusion Catheter Set". Whilst on DRC it is written as "Triple Lumen Infusion Catheter" and on technical offer "Medcomp" is mentioned as brand name. This is the violation of parameter no. 13(1) of evaluation criteria which stated," *Pakistan Embassy attested valid free sale certificate bearing the brand name of the product in the country of manufacturer including that the quoted*

	published specs. ***T.E#191*** *Grievance Against M/S 3N Lifemed You have approved 3 N life pharmaceuticals whereas the same should be rejected on below points:* *1) No GMP certificate and no has no international certification's and on the same basis you have rejected company in previous years as well as is direct violation of compulsory parameter clause 12 quality certification of US FDA/CE/JpMHLW/WHOMDD/ISO/GMP of the Valid product quoted* *2) The offered item is of low concentration the said product is rejected by the end user and the same low concentration products is offered again so should be rejected.* ***T.E#41 Grievance Against M/S Flowtronix*** *M/S Flowtronix is not the sole distributor for the quoted brand as this brand is being marketed by various companies in Pakistan. Secondly, the said company is also having numerous quality issues so it is requested to keep the status as rejected.* ***Grievance Against M/S Cardiac Care*** *Although the quoted item is already rejected but we want to re-emphasize that quoted item is not as per specification published which is direct violation of your bidding documents and is leading to an incomplete offer therefore should stand rejected.* ***Grievance Against M/S Almed Solution*** *Although the said company is rejected but we want to bring in notice point which is important that is M/S Allmed has quoted two lengths hence is bounding the institution whereas tender requirement is only of 7Fr without any intimation on lengths. What if hospital is in need of some other lengths?* *No experience in government sector. Therefore, it is requested to add below point in consideration as well and keep status as rejected.* ***Grievance Against M/S Hope Pharma*** *Although the said company is rejected but want to highlight below points which have been ignored:* *a) No product experience in government.* *b) No one year experience after registration which is violation* ***T.E#60*** *Kindly note that your Tender requirement is 12Fr 15cm, 13cm Qty. l 500 Please note that all companies quoted against Serial Number 60 should be therefore rejected as are violating compulsory parameter Clause 10*	as per specification) **M/s Allmed Solution** T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Non Responsive Rejected by End User (Guide Wire kinking needle attachment loose) **M/s Hope Pharma** T.E#41 CVP Line Adult Non Responsive Rejected By End User (Loose Needle Connector ,Loose catheter Clamp) **M/s Iqbal & Company** T.E# 60 Double Lumen Dialysis Catheter Non Responsive (FSC not Valid) Rejected by End User (syringe ,Knife, Sheet are Missing) **M/s Arfi International** T.E# 60 Double Lumen Dialysis Catheter (Responsive) **M/s UDL Distribution** T.E# 60 Double Lumen Dialysis Catheter(Responsive)	*product is freely available there for at least two years. This certificate must be issued by relevant authority of the country of origin duly legalized / notarized*." In addition to this, the Chairman Greivance committee being enduser of this product (managing Medical ward,HDU, ICU) recommended that during last one year use of same product, quality of the its guide wire, dilator and patency of lumen is very poor. Hence the firm's CVP line sample is rejected by the committee. The grievance against M/S 3 N – Lifemed for the quoted item at TE 191 Catheter Lock Solution, it is found that concentration is declared satisfactory by the end users for the intended use. However cGMP issued by the DRAP (compulsory) for local manufacturer does not include catheter lock solution in their scope. SO it is decided to declare bid of 3 N-Lifemed as **Non Responsive** for the item at **TE 191.** For their grievances at *T.E 41 (CVP Line Adult)* against various firms, it is concluded that all these have already been declared **NON RESPONSIVE** due to **REJECTION** by end user on multiple reasons. So no difference is made on their status of being **Non Responsive.** Same is the case for aggrieved firm's grievance against other bidders which quoted item at *TE 129 (Permanent Dialysis Catheter)* because of non- registration status of this item by DRAP. So all these will be remained **Non Responsive.** As far as grievance at *T.E 60 (Double Lumen 12 FR Catheter)* is concerned, total advertised quantity (*for all the mentioned three sizes*) is **3000**. Although in advertisement required quantities for two sizes i.e 13cm and 16 cm are mentioned as **1500** & **500** respectively but

	Bidder must submit the samples for bid evaluation as per advertised specification. Specifications quoted in the technical offer will be verified from samples provided with the bid. Product that comply 100% with the advertised *specifications and fulfill the requirements shall be considered & PPRA Clause 38 2a (iv) the procuring agency shall evaluate the technical proposal in the manner prescribed in advance, without reference to the price and shall reject any proposal which does not conform to the specified requirements:* ***1. M/S Arfi International**- Requirement is of 12Fr 15cm, 13cm Qty 1500. They have not quoted 13cm neither given sample whereas requirement is of 15cm, 13cm both. This leads to incomplete offer and should be rejected as per compulsory parameter and PPRA rules.* ***2. M/S UDL Distribution**- Requirement is of 12Fr 15cm, 13em Qty 1500. They have not quoted 15cm neither given samnple whereas requirement is of 15cm, 13cm both. This leads to incomplete offer and should be rejected as per compulsory parameter and PPRA rules.* ***3. M/S Allmed Solutions-** Requirement is of 12Fr 15cm, 13cm Qty l500. They have not quoted 13cm neither given sample whereas requirement is of15cm, 13cm both. This leads to incomplete offer and should be rejected as per compulsory parameter and PPRA rules.* ***4. M/S Hope Pharma**- Requirement is of 12Fr 15cm, 13 cm Qty 1500. They have not quoted any length whereas requirement is of 15cm, 13cm both.* *This leads to incomplete offer and should be rejected as per compulsory parameter and PPRA rules. Plus have No product experience in govt No one year experience after registration which is violation.* ***T.E#129 M/S Cardiac Care*** *Although the company is rejected but want to highlight below points as well:* *1) No product experience in govt.* *2) No one year experience after registration which is violation* *3) Registration is must being a Schedule D Item* ***M/S Allmed Solution:*** *Although the company is rejected but want to highlight below points as well:* *1) No product experience in govt.*	**M/s Allmed Solution** T.E# 60 Double Lumen Dialysis Catheter(Responsive) **M/s Hope Pharma** T.E# 60 Double Lumen Dialysis Catheter(Responsive) **M/s Iqbal & Company** T.E#191 Catheter Lock Solution (Responsive) **M/s 3N Lifemed** T.E#191 Catheter Lock Solution (Responsive) **M/s Iqbal & Company** T.E#129 Permanent Dialysis Catheter All sizes (Responsive) **M/s Cardiac Care** T.E#129 Permanent Dialysis Catheter All Sizes Non Responsive (Not Registered) **M/s Allmed Solution** T.E#129 Permanent Dialysis Catheter All Sizes Non Responsive (Not Registered)	against 15 cm, requisite quota is not printed. However it is understandable that "**remaining**" quantity is **1000** and should be considered for the later one. These quantities are advertised as per demand of end users (Nephrology/ Urology Departments). Albeit ideal situation would be to advertise three sizes against separate tender enquiry numbers however this is an essential item for critically ailing patients and any delay can bring challenges to cater demand. Since no single bidder quoted all three sizes so it is directed to consider these as sub parts a, b and c to proceed accordingly after financial bid opening. Furthermore end users rejected firm's quoted product at at T.E. 60 for its intended use. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, it is unanimously decided to ACCEPT the grievance against 3-N Lifemed for T.E 191 and to UPHOLD decision of TEC for items at TE 60 and TE 41. So their grievance at TE 60 and 41 is **REJECTED**. The decision at TE 129 and 41 for all firms will be remained same as end users rejected them.

	2) No one year experience after registration which is violation *3) Registration is must being a Schedule D Item.* *4) Have offered just two sizes 14Fr 19cm or 14Fr 23 cm whereas tender requirement is of "All Sizes". This is direct violation of your compulsory parameter and bidding documents and should be rejected."*		
4	**M/s Techzone** submitted grievance vide letter No.6915/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; *Grievance Against Evaluation Report Surgical Disposable Tender 2024-25* ***(Sr. No. 158, 164 to 167)*** *It is with reference to the Technical Evaluation report (copy attached Annex I) of Surgical Disposable items Tender (FY 2024-25) of your institution and to apprise that we are aggrieved by the Technical Evaluation report on the following grounds.* *1) For Sr. No. 158 i.e. Radevic Bottle with Drain their quoted brand has been declared non-responsive by the end user. However, the same have been used in your hospital without any complaint. It is requested to kindly get the samples of our product re-evaluated.* *2) For Sr No, 164 to 167 i.e Surgical Gloves Powder Free M/S Aqib Trading has been declared responsive However it does not have the Free Sale Certificate for it's quoted Brand AT-TEX. It is requested to review its Free Sale Certificate. In light of the above kindly look into our grievances and redress.* **M/s Techzone** submitted grievance vide letter No.6863/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; *"Subject: Grievance Against Evaluation Report Surgical Disposable Tender 2024-25 (Sr.* ***No. 23, 45, 53, 54, 58, 95, 96, 120, 121, 158, 172****)* *It is with reference to the Technical Evaluation report (copy attached Annex 1) of Surgical Disposable items. Tender (FY 2024-25) of your institution and to apprise that we are aggrieved by the Technical Evaluation report on the following grounds.* *1) For Sr. No. 172 i.e., Surgical Tape our quoted brand *Yashfaeen" Surgical paper Tape has been declared non-responsive by the end use for "Quality not being up to mark". However, ours' is a quality product which is not only*	**M/s Techzone** T.E#23 Butterfly Needle (Non Responsive Rejected By End User (Multiples Pricks Required to take Samples & Holder is stiff) **M/s Lab Link** T.E#23 Butterfly Needle (Responsive) **M/s Techzone** T.E#45 Disposable Gown (Responsive) **M/s 3N Lifemed Pharmaceuticals** T.E#45 Disposable Gown (Responsive) **M/s Techzone** T.E#53,54,58 Disposable Syringe 20ml,20ml side nozzle,60ml (Responsive) **M/s A.Feroz & Co** T.E#53,54,58 Disposable Syringe 20ml,20ml side nozzle,60ml (Responsive)	Mr. Muhammad Ali (CEO) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Techzone to explain the grievances against various firms on multiple items and also upon TEC result of their own quoted items too. The GRC scrutinized these matters by checking documents in the bids, sample evaluation reports and criteria to resolve the issues. The firm requested for re-evaluation of their items at TE 120 to 121, 158 & 172 (NG/ Feeding Tube, Radevic Bottle& Surgical Tape). But these samples were not approved by the end users with reasons and did not find satisfactory results for intended use. Grievance for item at TE 164 to 167 (Surgical Gloves Powder Free) against M/S Aqib trading company is **REJECTED** as the said Free sale Certificate possesses brand name. The objection raised by the Firm's representative against M/S 3 N – Lifemed over their quoted item at TE 45 (Disposable Gown) for not having Manufacturing License and valid GMP, was evaluated. It is revealed from documents in the bid that both are expired. Furthermore Manufacturing License and cGMP issued by the DRAP do not include Disposable Gown in their scope. SO it is decided to declare bid of 3 N-Lifemed as **Non Responsive** for the item at **TE 45.**

	being used in your hospital but also in all the leading teaching hospital of Punjab (copies of POs attached Annex 2). It is requested to kindly re-evaluate our product and declare us responsive. *Secondly, for the same product "Nepore" brand quoted by M/S Usman Enterprises has been declared responsive despite the fact that it has quoted a misbranded product and provided a misleading Technical proposal. While the product is registered with M/S Usman Enterprises (Karachi) as local manufacturer it has also mentioned Nitto Denko Japan as manufacturer. Additionally, the sample provided are also misbranded: the registration issued by the DRAP has mentioned M/S Usman Enterprises manufacturer while on the samples provided "Nitto Made in Japan" is mentioned. It is requested to* *declare the product non-responsive for quoting a misbranded product and misleading technical bid as the technical proposal and product are not complying with the registration letter issued by DRAP.* *It is requested to kindly look into the above as the evaluations are not only incongruent but reflect a bipartisan approach which is not only illegal but also unlawful and which aims at supporting and procuring an exorbitantly expensive product by singularly qualifying a misbranded product.* *2) Similarly, for Sr. No.* ***120 & 121*** *i.e. NG Tube/ Feeding Tube our brand Weracon has been declared non-responsive by the end user however the same product has been declared responsive in the third re- tender (copy attached Annex 3) of your institution* *3) For Sr.* ***No. 45 i.e., Disposable Gown*** *M/S 3N Lifemed Pharmaceuticals has been declared responsive however it does not have the Manufacturing License & GMP for its quoted product as required in the knock down clauses of compulsory parameters (Sr. No. 4 & 12 Pg. 33 of Bidding Docs).* *4) For Sr. No****. 53, 54, 58*** *i.e., Disposable Syringes 20ml, 20ml side nozzle, 60ml M/S A. Feroz & Co has been declared responsive. However, the bidder does not have the Free Sales Certificate for its quoted brand (Star) as required in the knock out clause. (copy Attached Annex 4). It is requested to kindly* *review the original FSC of the bidder.* *5) For Sr. No.* ***95 & 96*** *i.e. Incise Theater Drapes M/s SARU International has been declared responsive. However, the bidder does not have the free sales certificate for its quoted brand. (copy attached Annex 5)*	**M/s Techzone** T.E#95,96 Incise Theater Drapes (Responsive) M/s Saru International T.E#95,96 Incise Theater Drapes(Responsive) **M/s Techzone** T.E# 120 NG Tube /Feeding Tube (Non Responsive) Rejected by End User (More Rigid ,quality issue) M/s Techzone T.E# 121 NG Tube /Feeding Tube (Non Responsive) Rejected By End User (Quality Issue ,Move rigid) M/s Techzone T.E#158 Radevic Bottle with Drain (Non Responsive) Rejected By End User (Suction issue ,Measurement Scale Issue M/s Techzone T.E# 164,165,166,167 Surgical Gloves Powdered (Responsive) M/s Aqib Trading T.E# 164,165,166,167 Surgical Gloves Powdered (Responsive)	The firm was aggrieved over responsive status of M/S A-Feroze & Co. for their quoted items at T.E 53, 54 and 58 (Disposable Syringes 20ml, 20 ml side nozzle, 60ml). While going through the bid it was revealed that expired free sale certificate is attached in the bid as well as quoted brand name is not mentioned in it. SO it is decided to declare bid of *M/S A. Feroz & Co* as **Non Responsive** for the item at **TE.*53, 54 &58*** *i.e., Disposable Syringes 20ml, 20ml side nozzle, 60ml* **.** The representative uttered that M/S SARU International did not have free sale certificate with quoted brand for items at T.E 95 & 96. The matter was scrutinized by checking technical offer, free sale in the bid and sample provided. It is revealed that name of manufacturer name differs on sample and on free sale. So it is declared in valid. The grievance against M/S Lab Link for the quoted item at T.E 23 (Butterfly Needle) was evaluated. Quality certificate as per parameter No 12 of evaluation criteria, is attached. The grievance against M/S Usman Enterprises for item T.E 172 (Surgical Tape) is evaluated. Quality of the product is approved by the end users and is also registered by DRAP. The firm has mentioned Nitto Japan as the raw material source in its technical bid (ISO Certificate). Moreover it is a non DTL item. However confusion still lies regarding local manufacturing (*as per DML and cGMP certificates)* and "made in Japan" label inside the roll of sample. So it is decided to take direction from Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan which issued registration to the product. So it is decided to drop the tender of this product and

	6) For Sr. No. 23 i.e. Butterfly Needle our quoted brand has been declared non-responsive by the end-user however for the same product M/S Lab Link Enterprises has quoted "Nipro" and has been declared despite the fact that its provided CE certificate is not the for the manufacturing facility approved and mentioned in enlistment issued by DRAP. It is requested to kindly review the CE and enlistment certificate of the product and declares it non-responsive for having different addresses."		proceed further as no firm is RESPONSIVE against this TE 172. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the committee unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C for their own quoted items at T.E 120 to 121, 158 & 172 as well as for the said items quoted by M/s Aqib Trading and M/S Lab Link Entp. Hence grievance against above stated firms and for their own items is **REJECTED**. However it is decided to declare bid of M/S 3 N Lifemed International, M/S Saru International and M/S A. Feroze & Co. as **NON RESPONSIVE** for items quoted at "T.E 45" TE "95 & 96" and "53,54,58" respectively so grievance is **ACCEPTED** against them.
5	**M/s Kaumedex** submitted grievance vide letter No.6928/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; M/s Kaumedex put their grievance against the following firms: ***"M/s A. Feroz & Co*** *It is mentioned in the bid evaluation criteria Compulsory Parameters clause 13(1) regarding Pakistan Embassy attested Free Sale Certificate to be attached with the bid. Kindly ascertain if the aforementioned firm has attached the Pakistan Embassy attested Valid Free Sale Certificate with their bid. Please declare their bid non-responsive as failure to comply with compulsory parameter will result in "non-responsiveness" of the bidder.* ***M/s Care And Cure International*** *The firm has attached FDA certificate along with their bid of powdered latex surgical gloves as mentioned in TÁC of LGH, whereas effective January 18 2017 federal food and drug association FDA has placed a ban on powdered patient examination gloves, powdered surgical gloves, and also on powder for lubricating a surgeon's gloves. Therefore kindly disregard their FDA certificate and bid be declared" Non-Responsive".* *Moreover, kindly confirm the bid securities of all the firms who have participated in the above mentioned tender."*	**M/s Kaumedex** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Responsive) **M/s A.Feroz &Co** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Responsive) **M/s Care And Cure International** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Non Responsive) Rejected by End user (Low quality)	Mr. Ali Raza (Director Sales) attended the meeting on behalf of **M/S Kaumedix** to explain the grievance against M/S A-Feroz and M/S Care n Cure. The committee scrutinized the documents in the bid to conclude it. The free sale certificate for quoted item (at TE 168 to 171) provided by M/S A. Feroz, is not attested by the Pakistani Embassy which is violation of compulsory parameter 13(1). After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the committee unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S A. Feroze as **Non Responsive** for items quoted at T.E 169 to 171. Hence grievance is **ACCEPTED** against M/S A. Feroze & Co. However M/S Care n Cure *is already declared Non Responsive by Technical Evaluation Committee T.E.C* and it is decided to **UPHOLD** this decision of T.E.C.
6		**M/s Intra Health**	

	M/s Intra Health submitted grievance vide letter No.6892/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under; *"Kindly consider our grievances for the following products:* ***Sr. No. 106** Microburette Volumetric, 100ml Sterile pack* ***Sr. No. 161** Skin Stapler, 7mm length* ***Sr. No. 168 - 171** Surgical Gloves Latex Sterile Pack (Powdered) 6.5, 7.0, 7.5, 8.0 They have some reservations as following:* ***Sr. No. 106 Microburette Volumetric, 100ml Sterile pack:*** *M/s Cardiac Care quoted for Sr. No. 106 "SCM, China" brand and declared non-responsive due to sample rejection by the end user.* *Moreover, we bring into your kind notice that quoted product of M/s Cardiac Care does not have the market experience after the DRAP registration as product belongs to Medical Devices Schedule-E. Hence the past experience of quoted product before the DRAP registration should not be considered.* ***Sr. No. 161 Skin Stapler, 7mm length:*** *M/s Anwar & Sons quoted brand Advan for Sr. No. 161 and declared Responsive. We have reservation regarding the responsiveness of said product as same brand "Advan" declared non responsive in other major institutions as the firm failed to provide valid Free Sale Certificate with the quoted brand name. Please be informed that valid Free Sale Certificate with the brand name of quoted product is compulsory parameter for the evaluation of bid, therefore recheck the free sale certificate with the brand name and declare non responsive M/s Anwar & sons for Sr.No.161* *Sr. No. 168-171 Surgical Gloves, Latex, Sterile Pack (Powdered), Size: 6.5, 7.0, 7.5, 8.0 M/s A. Feroz & Co. quoted brand Supermax manufactured by Supermax Gloves Malaysia and declared Responsive.* *they have reservation regarding the responsiveness of said product as same brand "Supermax" declared non-responsive in other major institutions as the firm failed to provide valid notarized and Pakistani embassy attested Free Sale Certificate for the quoted brand name (for your kind reference copy of TEC report attached herewith.* *Furthernmore, M/s Kaumedex technically acceptance is questionable and against the general conditions of bidding documents as their past performance is very pitiful in different hospitals as well in LGH. They had been awarded the Same product but they were not able to complete their supplies of awarded quantities*	T.E#106 Micro burette Volumetric 100ml (Responsive) **M/s Cardiac Care** T.E#106 Micro burette Volumetric 100ml (Non Responsive) Rejected By End User **M/s Intra Health** T.E#161 Skin Stapler (Responsive) ***M/s Anwar & sons*** T.E#161 Skin Stapler (Responsive) **M/s Intra Health** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Responsive) **M/s A.Feroz &Co** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Responsive) **M/s Kaumedex** T.E# 168,169,170,171 Surgical Gloves Powered (Responsive)	Mr. Shahryar (Territory Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of **M/S Intra Health**. The representative described the grievance against various firms for different quoted items. The committee scrutinized the matters one by one to find conclusions. Grievance against M/S Cardiac Care: Though the firm is already being declared as Non Responsive for TE 106, however the condition of one year experience after registration is not included in evaluation criteria. Grievance against M/S Anwar A Sons: it is found that brand name of quoted item at TE 161 (Skin Stapler) is not mentioned on the free sale certificate so later is not valid as per clause 13(1) of the evaluation criteria. Grievance against M/S A. Feroze & Co: The free sale certificate for quoted item (at TE 168 to 171) is not attested by the Pakistani Embassy which is violation compulsory parameter 13(1). Grievance against M/S Kaumedix: It is found that in recent years, the said firm did not win any tender because of not participating or not amongst responsive/winning firms. However during Corona pandemic situation was challenging for every importer. Such situation does not exist now. After due deliberation and detailed discussion the committee unanimously decided to declare bids of M/S Anwar and Sons and M/S A. Feroze &Co. as **Non Responsive** for quoted items at T.E 161 and 168 to 171 respectively. Hence grievance is **ACCEPTED** against these firms. The grievance against M/S Kaumedex is **REJECTED** and

	and fulfilled the tender obligations. On the basis of poor past performance M/s Kaumedex should declare non responsive. Submitted for your kind consideration."		decision of T.E.C is **UPHELD** for their quoted items.
7	**M/s The Searle Company** submitted grievance vide letter No.6884/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under: *In response to 2% BID SECURITY we would please to inform you that remaining bid security is attached with financial proposal (copies attached).* *They are lodging grievance against two competing firms,* ***M/s Aqib Trading and M/s Techzone*** *in surgical gloves powder free and* ***M/s A-Feroz*** *in surgical gloves powdered, concerning their quotations and product specifications for surgical gloves.* ***Concerns Regarding M/s Aqib Trading:*** *Aqib Trading has quoted surgical gloves branded as AT Tex. However, upon a thorough review of their provided CE certificate and ISO 13485 certification, it has come to our attention that these certifications do not cover the advertised product specifications.* ***CE Certificate:*** *The CE certificate provided by Aqib Trading does not include sterilized surgical gloves within its scope. This raises concerns about the authenticity and regulatory compliance of their product.* ***ISO 13485 Certification:*** *The ISO 13485 certificate held by Aqib Trading pertains to sterilized rubber gloves, which differ significantly from the quoted product, i.e., sterilized latex gloves. This discrepancy indicates a potential misrepresentation of their product's compliance with international quality standards.* **** DRAP Registration:*** *According to the Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan (DRAP), the registration for Aqib Trading's product lists it as sterilized rubber gloves rather than sterilized latex gloves, further indicating inconsistency in their product documentation. Lack of Past Experience: M/s Aqib trading lacks prior experience with the quoted product, which are powder-free surgical gloves. This raises concerns about their capability to supply a product that meets the required standards.* ***Concerns Regarding M/s Techzone*** *M/s Techzone has quoted a brand name that differs from the original brand name of the manufacturer. Our concerns regarding M/s Techzone are as follows:*	**M/s The Searle company** T.E# 164-171 Surgical Gloves Non Responsive (Less 2% bid security) **M/s Aqib Trading** T.E# 164-171 Surgical Gloves (Responsive) **M/s Techzone** T.E# 164-171 Surgical Gloves (Responsive) **M/s A.Feroz & Co** T.E# 164-171 Surgical Gloves (Responsive)	Mr. Ahmad Iqbal (Regional Sales Manager) attended the meeting on behalf of **M/S The Searle**. The representative explained the grievance matter against multiple firms for items at T.E 164-171 (Powder Free & Powdered Surgical Gloves). He claimed that remaining bid security (form 2% less) is attached with the financial proposal. The claim will only be proved after opening of financial bid. The firm showed reservations over difference in quoted brand of M/S Aqib Trading Company with advertised specification of the product as well as their certifications. Upon evaluation it is found that quoted product of said company is registered by Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan and brief description clearly indicates "made from natural rubber latex". Samples were also found satisfactory by various end users and past experience was also attached in the bid. The representative questioned about the quality certificates, lack of past experience, incomplete information on the sample label, and misrepresentation of brand name in technical offer with original brand name of manufacturer quoted (T,E 164-171) by M/S Techzone. The matter is scrutinized on all aspects from bid and samples. It is revealed that brand name on the sample, DRAP registration and technical offer is same. Though a tiny correction was made on the name but it was completely endorsed and attested by Tender Purchase Committee. However the packaging of provided samples did not present the manufacturer address and country of origin along with Importer's name. Albeit this product

	Brand Name Misrepresentation*: The brand name quoted by M/s Techzone does not match the original brand name of the manufacturer, suggesting possible misbranding or counterfeit products.* ***Lack of Past Experience****: M/s Techzone lacks prior experience with the quoted product, which are powder-free surgical gloves. This raises concerns about their capabılity to supply a product that meets the required standards. Incomplete Product Information: Market feedback indicates that the samples provided by M/s Techzone lack critical information, such as the importer's name, manufacturing site address, and country of origin.* ***CE and IS0 Certification Verification:*** *The CE certificate provided by M/s Techzone does not clearly define the scope of the product and is not verified by NANDO. Additionally, their ISO certificates and Free Sales certificates require verification. It is also noted that only examination gloves are registered with the Medical Devices Authority (MDA) in Malaysia, which does not align with their quoted product specifications. Given the above discrepancies and potential misrepresentations, I kindly request the Grievance Committee to: Verify the authenticity and scope of the CE and ISO 13485 certificates provided by Aqib Trading and M/s Techzone.* *Ensure the quoted products are accurately represented and compliant with the specified standards and regulatory requirements. Investigate the discrepancies in DRAP registration and product documentation.* *Assess the past experience and capability of M/s Techzone& Aqib trading to supply powder-free surgical gloves.* ***Concerns regarding M/s A- Feroz:*** *I requested to honorable chairman to please recheck FSC of A-Feroz & co of quoted product surgical gloves powdered. We came to know that their FSC is not legalized / notarized by concerning bodies. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. We look forward to your favorable response and the necessary actions taken to address these grievances."*		was registered on 23.10.2023 and tender opening date was 03 .04.2024. The firm registered the grievance against M/S A. Feroze &Co. due to lack notarization of free sale certificate for their quoted items at T,E 164-171. The said certificate is checked and is found that free sale certificate is notarized but was not attested by Pakistan Embassy. So it is violation of Parameter no. 13(1) of evaluation criteria. After due deliberation and detail discussion, the Grievance Redressal Committee unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S A.Feroze & M/S Techzone as **Non Responsive** for their quoted items at T.E 164-171. Hence grievance against these firms, is **ACCEPTED.** However it is decided to **REJECT** the grievance against M/S Aqib Trading and to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C for the said quoted items. As far as matter of less bid security is concerned, the grievance will only be acceptable upon finding remaining bid security with financial bid. Otherwise the decision of T.E.C regarding bid of M/S Searle is in place and is **UPHELD**.

8	**M/s Mubarak Vision** submitted grievance vide letter No.6858/LGH Dated 24-06-2024, firm stated as under: *"We are writing to formally lodge a grievance concerning the recent Annual Tender for Surgical Disposables for the fiscal year 2024-25. It has come to our attention that two specific products included in the tender, under TE # 207 and TE # 209, do not meet the necessary regulatory and experience requirements.* ***1. *Vistrill Hydrophobic IOL (TE# 207)*:*** *This product lacks the Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan (DRAP) registration, which is a fundamental prerequisite for participation in this tender.* *Moreover, Vistrill Hydrophobic IOL does not have the requisite experience in the field, further disqualifying it from the tender.* ***2. *Gee Edge Knife (TE # 209)*;*** *Similar to the Vistrill Hydrophobic IOL, the Gee Edge Knife is also not registered with DRAP. Additionally, this product does not possess the required experience to be considered eligible for the tender. The inclusion of products that do not meet these critical requirements undermines the integrity of the procurement process and poses a potential risk to patient safety. I urge the procurement department to revisit the qualifications of these products and ensure that only those meeting the stringent standards are considered. Your prompt attention to this matter is highly appreciated. Please acknowledge the receipt of this grievance and inform me of the actions taken to address these concerns."*	**M/s Mubarak Vision** T.E#207 Foldable Intraocular Lens (IOL) (Responsive) **M/s Focus Surgical** T.E#207 Foldable Intraocular Lens (IOL) (Responsive) **M/s Mubarak Vision** T.E#209 Phaco Knife (Responsive) **M/s Focus Surgical** T.E#209 Phaco Knife (Responsive)	Mr. Nazir Ahmad attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Mubarak Vision. The representative described the grievance against M/S Focus Surgical. The committee scrutinized the matter by checking the documents in the bid. it is found that the item at T.E 207 Foldable Intraocular Lens (IOL) quoted by the said company is registered in Class "C" by the Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan (DRAP) on 23.01.2024 and the other item at 209 belongs to class B which is still under exemption period until 31.12.2024 as per SRO No 224 (I) /2023, dated 27.02.2023 issued by DRAP. Market experience (in the form of Purchase Orders) is also attached in the bid. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, it is unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**

Mr. Muhammad Ali, Biomedical Engineer/
(**Member)**Technical Officer LGH, Lahore

Dr. Ghias-ul-Hassan,
(Member) Assistant Prof. of Gastroenterology

Prof. Dr. Faheem Afzal
(Member) Prof. of Pediatrics

Prof. Dr. Khizer Hayat,
(Member) Prof. of Urology

Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi,
(Chairperson) Prof. of Medicine