**EVALUATION REPORT**  
*(As Per Rule 35 of PP Rules, 2004)*

1. Name of Procuring Agency: National Bank of Pakistan  
2. Method of Procurement: 36 (b) - Single Stage Two Envelope Procedure  
3. Title of Procurement: Procurement of Trade Processing System  
4. Tender Inquiry No.: NBP/LSG/OPG/17042018  
5. PPRA Ref. No. (TSE): TS352621E  
6. Date & Time of Bid Submission: May 25, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.  
7. Date & Time of Bid Opening: May 25, 2018 at 10:30 a.m.  
8. No of Bids Received: One (01)  
10. Details of Bid(s) Evaluation: As follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Bidder</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Total Evaluated Cost (USD)*</th>
<th>Rule/Regulation/SBD*/Policy/Basis for Rejection/Acceptance as per Rule 35 of PP, 2004.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/s. InfoTech Pvt. Ltd.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,057,895/-</td>
<td>Lowest Evaluated Bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All costs are inclusive of all applicable taxes except GST

**Lowest Evaluated Bidder:** M/s. InfoTech Private Limited

11. Any other additional / supporting information, the procuring agency may like to share.  
   - Annexure II- Evaluation Criteria

Wing Head ITPW  
Logistic Support Group
Annexure II

Evaluation Criteria
Procurement of Trade Processing System
Tender ID: NBP/LSG/OPG/17042018

The bids/proposals with all complete documents submitted on the bid submission date will be evaluated as under.

1. All Bidders are required to submit filled, correct and complete Annexure III – Technical Requirement Document along their bid. If the Bidder fails to do so, its bid will be considered as automatically rejected. All Bidders are also requested to affix their company’s stamp/signature on the provided Annexure III – Technical Requirement Document.

2. If any Bidder mentions proposes financial details (i.e. price, cost, bid security amount etc.) in its TECHNICAL PROPOSAL or in response to any NBP clarification query during the technical evaluation, its bid will be deemed as rejected.

3. For evaluation of software/product functional requirements mentioned in Annexure-III Technical Requirement Document, NBP will request bidders to demonstrate their proposed software to NBP during evaluation stage, at no extra cost to NBP. If any bidder fails to demonstrate its respective solution, its bid will be considered as technically disqualified / rejected / non-responsive. The place, date & time of demonstration sessions will be communicated to bidders separately by NBP.

4. Technical Requirements mentioned in Annexure III – Technical Requirement Document with “Priority (High/Low)” is evaluated as follows:
   a. For evaluation purpose, a desired response of only ‘Y’, ‘Yes’, ‘N’, ‘No’, ‘C’ ‘Customizable’ is required in the availability column for all technical requirements (mentioned in all sheets of Annexure III – Technical Requirement Document). Bidder may provide ‘C’ (Customization required) only against requirements # from 7.05 to 34.05 in “Technical Requirements”, which should not exceed 20% of those requirements. If bidder responses of ‘C’ against those ‘High’ Priority requirements become greater than 20%, its bid will be considered as technically disqualified / rejected / non-responsive.
   b. All technical requirements with “High” Priority must be answered as ‘Y’ or ‘C’. If bidder response ‘N’ against any of such “High” Priority requirement, its bid will be considered as technically disqualified and will be rejected.
   c. For all “Mandatory” marking technical requirements against which
Bidder is responding “Y”, the Bidder should specify the proper reference of the proposal in the reference / substantiation column. NBP may request for any other additional documentary evidence against any requirement that must be provided by the Bidder during the period of evaluation. Bidders should respond to such requests within the time frame indicated in the letter/fax/ e-mail seeking the explanation. In the event of a Bidder failing to provide the reference or any information sought/document requested by NBP, its bid will be deemed to be technically disqualified and will be rejected.

d. All technical requirements with “Low” Priority can be answered as ‘Y’, ‘Yes’, ‘N’, ‘No’ or ‘C’ ‘Customizable’. If bidder responds ‘N’ or ‘No’ against any of the “Low” Priority requirement, its bid will not be considered as rejected.

e. For all requirements against which Bidder is not providing any response (i.e. an empty availability cell or an availability cell with a response other than “Y’/‘Yes’ or ‘N’/‘No’ or ‘C’/‘Customizable’), NBP will first check that against such requirements proper reference documents have been provided or not in the submitted bid. If reference document is found then NBP ask clarification from the bidder about its response, however if reference document will also not found or provided then response of bidder shall be considered as ‘No’ and its bid will be considered as rejected if the requirement item is high priority.

f. The bidders are required to include the price of all requirements with ‘High’ priority where the response is ‘Y’ and ‘C’ in its financial proposal as the price mentioned in financial proposal will be considered as final and cannot be increased in any case after the submission of bid.

5. The prices will be evaluated on the basis of items mentioned in Annexure III – Technical Requirement and Annexure VII- BOQ of the RFP documents.

6. The prices proposed by the Bidders will be evaluated on the solution, cost of additional development, if required and one (1) year support and maintenance cost.

7. Bid from the technically qualified Bidders and the Bidder having the lowest evaluated price/cost will be considered as lowest evaluated Bid and accepted by NBP for the award of the contract.

8. As per requirement of ITB 31 mentioned in Annexure VI – Standard Bidding Document of RFP, NBP may conduct a post-qualification evaluation exercise for the Bidder which is selected as having submitted the lowest evaluated bid. A negative evaluation will result in rejection of the Bidder’s bid, in which event NBP shall proceed to the next lowest evaluated bidder to make a similar evaluation.