

# CH. PERVAIZ ELAHI INSTITUTE OF CARDIOLOGY, MULTAN

## MINUTES OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

**Agenda:** Redressal of grievances received against technical evaluation of technical bids for the procurement of drugs/medicines through annual tender for the financial year 2024-25.

**Venue:** Conference Room, CPEIC Multan

**Date & Time:** Monday 29-07-2024 at 10:30 AM

1. The following officers / members of the committee attended the meeting.

|                                                                            |                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| i. <b>Prof. Dr. Tariq Abbas</b><br>Professor of Cardiology                 | <br>Chairman |
| ii. <b>Prof. Dr. Muhammad Younas</b><br>Professor of Paediatric Cardiology | <br>Member   |
| iii. <b>Dr. Iftikhar Paras</b><br>Associate Professor of Cardiac Surgery   | <br>Member   |
| iv. <b>Dr. Aamir Furqan</b><br>Associate Professor of Anaesthesia          | <br>Member   |
| v. <b>Dr. Hira Bushra</b><br>Assistant Professor of Radiology              | <br>Member   |
| vi. <b>Dr. Shumail Kanwal Hashmi</b><br>Assistant Professor of Pathology   | <br>Member  |
| vii. <b>Dr. Hafiz Muhammad Asad Ullah</b><br>DMS (Admin)                   | <br>Member |

2. The following aggrieved bidders or their representatives attended the meeting on behalf of their respective firms/companies (attendance of meeting attached).

|                                        |                                             |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| i. M/s AGP Ltd.                        | iii. M/s Brookes Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.          |
| ii. M/s Atco Laboratories Ltd.         | vi. M/s Hilton Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.            |
| iv. M/s Caraway Pharmaceuticals        | ix. M/s Mass Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.              |
| v. M/s CCL Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.  | xii. M/s Saffron Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd. |
| viii. M/s Hudson Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.     | xv. M/s WnS Feild Pharmaceuticals           |
| x. M/s Mega Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.          |                                             |
| xiii. M/s Sanofi Aventis Pakistan Ltd. |                                             |

P.T.O.

3. The committee started with the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful and the Incharge Pharmacist (Medicines Purchase) presented the Technical Evaluation Report of drugs/medicines for the F.Y. 2024-25 and briefed the grounds of acceptance or rejection of a firm as whole or any individual quoted item by a specific bidder out of its all quoted items in accordance with the advertised Evaluation Criteria. The Chairman appraised the efforts of Technical Evaluation Committee for evaluating huge file to conclude the detailed technical evaluation report.

4. The non-responsive technical offers of aggrieved bidder were discussed in detail with the members of the Grievance Committee and present members of the Technical Evaluation Committee. The submission of aggrieved bidders in response to the technical rejection were also discussed one-by-one in the light of Technical Evaluation Criteria, the contents of the already submitted technical bids and the documents / supporting presented in the grievance submission. The aggrieved bidders or their representative also appeared before the committee one-by-one to present and elaborate its stance before the committee. The committee after detailed deliberation, discussion and review of the available documents/records concluded the following:

| Sr. | Aggrieved Bidder Name         | Grievance against Rejection of | Tender Sr. #             | Proceedings, Discussions & Recommendations                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Decision of Grievance Committee                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.  | M/s AGP Ltd.                  | All the quoted brands          | 54,81<br>91,92<br>95,145 | <p><u>Discussions:</u><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the excuse that some documents may be missed at the time of tender submission during rush work of tenders' preparation as all the tenders in Punjab are at the same time and due to sudden change in criteria by SHC&amp;MED this year.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><u>Proceedings:</u><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)</p> | <p>The Committee decided to declare following quoted brands of AGP Ltd. as <b>"Responsive"</b> which meet the desired evaluation criteria after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance:</p> <p>i. <b>Inj. Maxna 500mg</b><br/>ii. <b>Susp. Ceclor 125mg</b><br/>iii. <b>Tab. Algocin 500mg</b></p> <p>While rest of the items failed to obtain qualifying marks (48 out of 80)</p> |
| 2.  | M/s Brookes Pharma (Pvt) Ltd. | Inj. D-Cort                    | 110                      | <p><u>Discussions:</u><br/>The representative of the firm presented affidavit for experience of the quoted items in private sector and requested to consider the its marks in bid evaluation.</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the said affidavit if it is valid.</p> <p><u>Proceedings:</u><br/>The affidavit was found valid by the present members of TEC</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <p>Committee decided to declare <b>Inj. D-Cort</b> as <b>"Responsive"</b> after considering the marks of said affidavit submitted in the grievance.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

|    |                             |                       |                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|----|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3. | M/s Caraway Pharmaceuticals | All the quoted brands | 6,9,50, 51,54, 89,90, 91,141 142, 144, & 149 | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The firm was declared non-responsive on the basis of invalid cGMP Certificate issued by DRAP. The chairman required the firm to provide valid cGMP certificate or even valid Satisfactory Inspection Report by DRAP in this meeting. The representative stated that they have valid cGMP Inspection Report while cGMP Certificate is still awaited and presented copy of inspection report.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The chairman after discussion with the members decided to accept the Inspection Report and recommended to declare the items as "Responsive" which fulfill the ordinary parameters criteria / qualifying marks.</p> | <p>Upon report from the Technical Evaluation Committee members, the Grievance Committee declared following quoted items of Caraway Pharma as "Responsive".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inj. Ondenles 8mg</li> <li>2. Inj. Carapamin 200mg</li> <li>3. Inj. Cara-Doba 250mg</li> <li>4. Inj. Sactum 1gm</li> <li>5. Inj. Sactum 2gm</li> <li>6. Inj. Carazone 1gm</li> <li>7. Inj. Kolbi 10mg</li> <li>8. Inj. Caralac 30mg</li> </ol> <p>While rest of the items failed to obtain qualifying marks (48 out of 80)</p> |
| 4. | M/s CCL Pharmaceuticals     | Tab. NoClot 75mg      | 61                                           | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the Delivery Challans and missing documents regarding Technical Staff and requested to consider the missing documents.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC).</p>                                                                                                                                                                                        | <p>Committee decided to declare Tab. NoClot 75mg as "Responsive" after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| 5. | M/s Hilton Pharma           | Tab. Rolip 10mg       | 64                                           | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents regarding Technical Staff and requested to consider the missing documents.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC).</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <p>Committee decided to declare Tab. Rolip as "Responsive" after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

|    |                           |                       |                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6. | M/s Hudson Pharma         | All the quoted brands | 66,68 & 93     | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents regarding Availability of quoted products in Chain Pharmacies and requested to consider the missing documents. The chairman inquired about the availability of bioequivalence studies of Easehale and Beeko nebulizing solutions with research brands Atem &amp; Glenil however the firm failed to provide bioequivalence studies of the same.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks of Inj. Amak (Tender Sr. No. 93) after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC).</p> | Committee decided to declare <b>Inj. Amak 500mg</b> only as “ <b>Responsive</b> ” after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance while other two items failed to qualify even in grievance submission. |
| 7. | M/s Maple Pharmaceuticals | Tab. Calzem 30mg      | 43             | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the excuse that some documents may be missed at the time of tender submission during rush work of tenders’ preparation as all the tenders in Punjab are at the same time and due to sudden change in criteria by SHC&amp;MED this year.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)</p>                                                                                     | Committee decided to declare <b>Tab. Calzem 30mg</b> as “ <b>Responsive</b> ” after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance and on the basis of previous experience held in this institute.           |
| 8. | M/s Mass Pharma           | All the quoted brands | 34,44<br>64,91 | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the excuse that some documents may be missed at the time of tender submission during rush work of tenders’ preparation as all the tenders in Punjab are at the same time and due to sudden change in criteria by SHC&amp;MED this year.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the bid and documents</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The technical bid was reevaluated was found non-qualifying required marks (48 out of 80) even after reevaluation.</p>                                                                                                                  | Committee decided to reject the appeal of <b>M/s Mass Pharma (Pvt) Ltd.</b> as the firm failed to qualify desired qualification marks even in grievance submission.                                                        |






|     |                                |                                          |           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9.  | M/s Mega Pharmaceuticals       | Tab. ATL<br>50mg                         | 24        | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented that the firm is supplying quoted brand in different DHAs in Punjab. The chairman inquired about the availability and satisfactory experience certificate of said brand in leading cardiac institutes in Punjab and the firm failed to ascertain the same.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Committee decided to reject the appeal of Mega Pharma as the firm failed to ascertain its availability in leading Cardiac Institutes of Punjab                                                                                              |
| 10. | M/s Saffron Pharmaceuticals    | Tab. Hypotin<br>5mg & Inj.<br>Sonnet 1gm | 44&91     | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the claim the valid documents were already attached with the bid and may be overlooked during evaluation.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the bid and documents</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The technical bid was reevaluated was found non-qualifying required marks (48 out of 80) even after reevaluation.</p>                                                                                                                                                                    | Committee decided to reject the appeal of <b>M/s Saffron Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd.</b> as the firm failed to qualify desired qualification marks even in grievance submission.                                                             |
| 11. | M/s Shazeb Pharmaceutical Ind. | All the quoted brands                    | IV Fluids | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the missing documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the excuse that some documents may be missed at the time of tender submission during rush work of tenders' preparation as all the tenders in Punjab are at the same time and due to sudden change in criteria by SHC&amp;MED this year.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the marks after considering the documents submitted in the bid.</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The qualifying marks were reevaluated by the present members of Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)</p> | Committee decided to declare IV Fluids quoted by Shazeb Pharmaceutical Industries as <b>"Responsive"</b> after considering the missing documents submitted in the grievance and on the basis of previous experience held in this institute. |
| 12. | M/s WnS Feild Pharmaceuticals  | Tab. Hexla<br>75mg                       | 61        | <p><b><u>Discussions:</u></b><br/>The representative of the firm presented the documents and requested to consider the missing documents with the claim the valid documents were already attached with the bid and may be overlooked during evaluation.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations:</u></b><br/>The committee recommended to reevaluate the bid and documents</p> <p><b><u>Proceedings:</u></b><br/>The technical bid was reevaluated was found non-responsive to the evaluation criteria even after reevaluation.</p>                                                                                                                                                                       | Committee decided to reject the appeal of <b>M/s WnS Feild</b> as the firm failed to fulfill desired evaluation criteria even in grievance submission.                                                                                      |

5. The grievance filed by M/s Premier Agencies against acceptance of Inj. Kopaq (tender Sr. No. 153) offered by M/s Punjab Medical Services and grievance filed by M/s Atco Laboratories against acceptance of Inj. Tirostu (tender Sr. No. 63) offered by M/s Punjab Medical Services were also discussed in the meeting. The representatives of M/s Premier Agencies & M/s Atco Laboratories requested to re-evaluate the technical offer of said brands and objected that said brand doesn't possess valid EMA/USFDA status as per evaluation criteria. The representative from M/s Premier Agencies also objected the MRP of Inj. Kopaq that it is not as per DRAP SRO and also claimed that Inj. Kopaq not prequalified in DGHS Punjab upon rejection on such grounds as well. The representative from M/s Atco Laboratories also added that technical offer of Punjab Medical Services is also Non-Responsive in CPEIC Wazirabad.

The Chairman expressed gratitude towards both the companies to point out such observations and ensured that the committee will conclude its decision after having discussion and response from the respondent firms regarding the said observations. Mr. Imtiaz from M/s Punjab Medical Services was called to respond to the said observations. Mr. Imtiaz presented documents regarding enlistment of Inj. Kopaq & Inj. Tirostu on EMA website other documents about registration of said brands in European countries Bulgaria.

**Decision:** After scrutiny of documents presented by M/s Punjab Medical Services and verification of from EMA website, the committee unanimously decided to uphold the decision of Technical Evaluation Committee and rejected the appeal of M/s Premier Agencies & M/s Atco Laboratories

6. The grievance filed by M/s Sanofi Aventis Pakistan Ltd. against acceptance of Inj. Noxane (tender Sr. No. 58) offered by M/s BF Biosciences Ltd. and was also discussed in the meeting. The representatives of M/s Sanofi Aventis requested to re-evaluate the technical offer of Inj. Noxane and objected that said brand doesn't possess Bio-similarity Study Report as per compulsory parameter of evaluation criteria. The representative also added that technical offer of Inj. Noxane is also Non-Responsive in PIC Lahore and presented Technical Evaluation Report of PIC.

The Chairman expressed gratitude towards Sanofi Aventis Pakistan to point out such observations and ensured that the committee will conclude its decision after having discussion and response from the respondent firm regarding the said observations. Mr. Saeed from M/s BF Biosciences was called to respond to the said observations. Mr. Saeed presented Bio-similarity Study of Inj. Noxane other documents about API source from USFDA approved firm and the import trail of the same.

**Decision:** After scrutiny of documents presented by M/s BF Biosciences and verification of from USFDA website, the committee unanimously decided to uphold the decision of Technical Evaluation Committee and rejected the appeal of M/s Sanofi Aventis Pakistan

7. The meeting ended by vote of thanks by the Chairman Grievance Committee.



**Dr. Hira Bushra** (Member)  
Assistant Prof. of Radiology  
CPEIC, Multan



**Dr. Iftikhar Paras** (Member)  
Associate Prof. of Cardiac Surgery  
CPEIC, Multan



**Dr. Aamir Furqan** (Member)  
Associate Prof. of Anaesthesia  
CPEIC, Multan



**Dr. Hafiz M. Asad Ullah** (Member)  
D.M.S (Admin)  
CPEIC, Multan



**Prof. Dr. Tariq Abbas**  
Chairman, Grievances Committee  
Prof. of Cardiology, CPEIC, Multan



**Dr. Shumaila Kanwal Hashmi** (Member)  
Assistant Prof. of Pathology  
CPEIC, Multan



**Dr. Muhammad Younas** (Member)  
Professor of Paediatric Cardiology  
CPEIC, Multan