

Ref: ECIL/D&C/67/2010/
Date: Thursday, 18th March 2010

Mr. Muhammad Anees Sadozal,
Director General (Services),
Higher Education Commission,
H-9, Islamabad
Page 1 of 2

SUBJECT: CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN UNIVERSITY, MULTAN.

Dear Sir,

Based on the numbers announced in a meeting of 17th March 2010, in the office of the HEC, Islamabad for the subject project, where ECIL was announced to have received 47.4 marks and thus declared disqualified for financial opening. We are surprised and shocked, as a similar TOR for the 3 major universities, not too long ago were advertised by HEC, where ECIL's similar winning methodology which subsequently won ECIL all three universities, amounting to Rs. 30.0 Billion, through competitive process. has now rendered us disqualified for reasons best known to HEC. On this aspect we have to submit to you as follows;

ECIL was qualified for the subject project and was invited for making a presentation of their Concept Master Plan and other details. The required presentation was made on 22nd February 2010. Subsequently, upon the presentation we were invited to submit Technical and Financial Proposals vide your letter No 1-467/HEC/RE/09-886 dated 1st March 2010.

We submitted our Technical and Financial Proposals vide our letter No. ECIL/D&C/67/2010/1341 dated 13th March 2010, fully in compliance with the requirements laid down in the RFP document.

The basic Evaluation Criteria laid down in the RFP document in Data Sheet Annex – A has been QCBS with 80% marks for the Technical Proposal and 20% marks for Financial Proposal.

Detailed Evaluation Criteria laid down in the RFP document in Data Sheet Annex – A is reproduced as under:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| • Conceptual Master Plan of the University | 30 points |
| • Methodology for Execution of the Proposal | 30 points |
| • Proposed Team for the Project | 20 points |
| • Time Frame for Project Activities | 20 points |

Since ECIL was invited for submitting the Technical and Financial Proposals subsequent to successful presentation of their proposed Concept, it is understood that the Concept plan satisfied the HEC's requirements. Since we were invited for submitting the Proposal, subsequent to the presentation of the Concept, we were convinced that we must have scored at least 60 to 70% points.

Kindly appreciate that the RFP / TOR issued for this subject university is similar to the RFP / TOR issued for the earlier university projects advertised by HEC and were subsequently awarded to ECIL, as follows;

- Planning, Design and Construction Supervision of the Engineering Universities at Lahore.
- Planning, Design and Construction Supervision of the Engineering Universities at Karachi.
- Planning, Design and Construction Supervision of the Engineering Universities at Sialkot.

Hence, the Methodology proposed by ECIL for the subject University at Multan is very much similar to what we proposed for the above referred three (03) Universities. We are perplexed as to what has gone wrong with our Methodology which warrants such a low ranking to our proposal by HEC Evaluation Committee.

Ref: ECLD/06/272019
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2010
Mr. Muhammad Anas Saifullah,
Director General (Services),
Higher Education Commission,
H-8, Islamabad
Page 1 of 2

While RFP was silent about the details of the team to be proposed by the Consultants, we proposed a team of qualified professionals for all the disciplines that would be involved in carrying out the project activities. In this respect, we submitted CVs of 31 professionals on the prescribed format. Our estimate was that we should have scored at least 75 to 80% for the proposed team based on their qualification and experience.

As for the Time Frame, the RFP just mentioned time for Master Planning and Design. Considering the mentioned timelines for planning and design and assuming time for construction, we prepared a Time Frame / Activity Schedule, elaborating upon the requirements spelled out in the RFP. In this aspect of the Evaluation, we do not see any reason why ECIL would not score well, while we have fully complied with the requirements of the TOR.

Furthermore, the Proposals by minimum eight (08) Consultants were submitted on 15th March 2010, by 1400 hours. It is assumed that no evaluation process was initiated on the same day. The Technical scores were announced on 17th March at 1500 hours, leaving only one and a half working days for the evaluation of the proposals.

Based on the foregoing, it is to our utter shock and surprise that our Technical Proposal was awarded only 47.4 points out of 100 and hence our Technical Proposal was disqualified.

We, therefore, strongly feel that in such a short period of time available to the Evaluation Committee of HEC, some aspects of our Technical Proposal may have been inadvertently overlooked. We therefore strongly request that HEC Evaluation Committee may please revisit their Evaluation. If, however, HEC Evaluation Committee finds that our Technical Proposal that won us three (03) major Universities could now not even qualify us for the opening of financial proposal, then we feel justified to request HEC to please provide us the Evaluation and ranking details that rendered us disqualified.

We further request that HEC may please hold the process of negotiation and award of the Project in abeyance till such time that it is established that ECIL Proposal was indeed disqualified on merit. At the same time we request that the Evaluation Process be revisited, so that there is no inadvertent injustice is done to ECIL.

The above request has been made keeping in view the reputation of HEC and the perception that the Evaluation and Award process has been Transparent and based on just merit.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely
for ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS INTERNATIONAL (Pvt) LTD.



(Muhammad Irfan Jan)
Manager (Development)

Cc: (1) Chairman, HEC.
(2) Deputy Chairman, HEC.
(3) PPRA.
(4) Transparency International Pakistan.