

SINDH BUILDING CONTRACTORS ORGANIZATION

Registration No. DGS(W)S-2237-A Ref: 182-Khi, 17/05/2022

To,

The Managing Director.
Sindh Public Procurement Regulatory Authority
Karachi

SUBJECT: COMPLAINT AGAINST NIT BY THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER PROVINCIAL BUILDING DIVISION HYDERABAD "ESTABLISHMENT OF SECRETARIAT COMPLEX FOR SINDH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AT HYDERABAD (ADP # 2445 OF 2021-22) NIT NO. G-55/1390/OF 2022 DATED: 25/04/2022

With reference to the Letter No. TC/G-55/1615/ Of 2022 PBD Hyderabad Dated: 12/05/2022 and in continuation to our Previous Letter No. Ref. 181-Khi, 09/05/2022; through this letter it is again humbly requested to take action against this NIT which is purely based on Malafide; this false NIT can be clearly seen on SPPRA PPMS Website hoisted without Newspapers advertisement of NIT & corrigendum contrary to Rule-17(2) of SPP Rules, 2010, and most importantly without Bidding document (Only BOQ Uploaded). SPPRA Comments as per preliminary assessment has been generated on PPMS Website (Dated: 11-05-2022); same has been ignored by the Procuring Agency.

Most of the Eligibility conditions after corrigendums are still contrary to the Rule-44 of SPP Rules 2010, with so many discriminatory and difficult conditions in order to facilitate blue eyed contractors. Dates of NIT hoisting and corrigendum are also questionable, as mentioned below:

NIT / corrigendum	Publication Dates	<u>Objections</u>
NIT Publication on PPMS	02-05-2022	Hoisted on Public Holiday Without uploading published copy of leading and widely circulated newspaper
		Major parts of bidding documents i.e Instructions to bidders, Terms & Conditions, Bidding data information, Evaluation Criteria etc. as per Rule-21 of SPP Rules, 2010 neither uploaded with NIT nor it has been uploaded till date.
1st Corrigendum	02-05-2022	Method of Procurement and several eligibility conditions changed without extension of Dates & no published copy newspaper against Rule-17(2) of SPP Rules, 2010.
2 nd Corrigendum	16-05-2022	False corrigendum uploaded, with false conditions and no newspaper advertisement; against Rule-17(2) of SPP Rules, 2010.
		2 nd Corrigendum Says "(B) Experience of the Firm / Company · Condition of 1000 Million or above cost works Experience and completion of One Helipad/Hangar project by CAA" condition which are in bidding document is not valid.
		Firstly no bidding document found with NIT, secondly no such condition seen in NIT and Lastly no such experience of Firm is pertain to the said NIT. Thus major Tampering have been done here which is self-explanatory.

Page 1 of 2



SINDH BUILDING CONTRACTORS ORGANIZATION

Registration No. DGS(W)S-2237-A

Following Major violations and objections has not been omitted after last two corrigendums, however few more objectionable amendments have been done mentioned below which arises questions over the transparency of NIT:

NIT Conditions / Corrigendum	Objections
Method of Procurement and time allowed	Method of Procurement has been changed from Single
for completion changed	Stage – Two Envelop to Singe Stage, One envelop, with
(1st corrigendum)	no revision of date and time of opening & submission.
(160 colligorium)	Also without advertising in newspaper.
	Completion time changed from 24 Months to 36 Months
PEC Category required is C-1 Or above	As per Corrigendum Estimated Cost of Work is 490
(1st corrigendum)	Million thus Category required for the said work will be
	C3 or above
PEC Specialization Codes asked in NIT	The specialization codes which are not pertain to this
not relevant.	work has not been deleted in recent corrigendum; CE-01,
	CE-02, CE-04, BC-01, BC-02, BC-3, ME-02, ME-03, EE-
	01, EE-02, EE-03, EE-09, EE-11.
Available Bank credit line shall be 25%	This Condition has not been changed or deleted from
of Bid cost	NIT.
List of Machinery & equipment available	This Condition has not been changed or deleted from nit.
with documentary proof of its ownership	mi c iii i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
The bidder having project experience of	This Condition has not been changed or deleted from NIT
international reputed firms will be given	
extra points	Mile and divine in contrasts to the Dules 44 of CDD Dules
Undertaking on stamp paper that firm is	This condition is contrary to the Rule-44 of SPP Rules 2010, as litigation history / list of litigation condition
not involved in any kind of litigation	have already been made asked in NIT at Sr. No. (e), thus
(1st corrigendum)	asking for no litigation Undertaking in 1st corrigendum is
	false practice
	Taloc practice

It is therefore humbly requested to please take immediate action and ask the Executive Engineer Provincial Building Division Hyderabad for not following SPPRA Rules and regarding several violations of SPPRA Rules 2010 amended 2019. Thus kindly ask the Engineer to call fresh tender in order to get healthy competition.

Tha

(PRESIDENT)
Sindh Building Co

Copy forwarded with kind-compliments and further necessary action to:

zation

- The Chief Secretary, Government of Sindh, Karachi

ctors O

* NO/

- The Director General, National Accountability Bureau, Sindh Karachi
- The Chairman, Anti- Corruption Establishment, Sindh Karachi
- The Secretary, (G.A), SGA&CD Department, Government of Sindh
- The Managing Director (Mr. Adil Gillani), Transparency International Pakistan
 - The Chief Engineer, Buildings Department, Hyderabad
 - The Superintending Engineer, Provincial Buildings Circle, Hyderabad
 - The Executive Engineer Provincial Building Division, Hyderabad
 - Office Copy

Page 2 of 2

OTHER: