Minutes of the Opening of Bids

Project: Waterproofing of the Philippine Embassy Complex

(Chancery, Ambassador's Residence, Lanai, ATN Shelter, Guardhouse, Driver's Lounge)

Procuring Entity: Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines in Islamabad, Pakistan
Procurement Method: Public Bidding, Two-Envelope System (RA 9184 and its IRR)
Date: 15 October 2025
Time & Venue: 10:04 AM, Chancery Conference Room, Philippine Embassy, Islamabad

I. Call to Order and Opening Formalities

The meeting was called to order by the **BAC Chair** at 10:04 AM. The Chair welcomed all bidders and observers and explained that the opening of bids would be conducted pursuant to Republic Act No. 9184 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) under the two-envelope system. A brief overview of the process and house rules was given noting that:

- Each bidder should have submitted two sealed envelopes: **(1) Technical** and **(2) Financial**.
- Only bidders that pass the Technical evaluation will have their Financial proposals opened.
- To ensure order and fairness, comments or interruptions during the opening/evaluation would not be entertained; clarifications may be submitted **in writing** to the BAC Secretariat after the proceedings.
- The Committee upholds transparency, integrity, and equal opportunity in the procurement process.

II. Attendance

BAC:

Mr. Juan Paolo G. Alix, BAC Chairperson
Mr. Christian Glenn B. Baggas, BAC Vice-Chairperson
Ms. Mary Ann E. Lumang, BAC Member
Ms. Mary Grace M. Recolizado, BAC Member
Ms. Charlyn C. Lau, BAC Member

TWG/Secretariat:

Ms. Danica Carla Mae M. Torres, BAC-TWG/Secretariat, Head
Mr. Billy S. Aguilar, BAC-TWG/Secretariat, Member
Ms. Remedios G. Zafra, BAC-TWG/Secretariat, Member (Absent)

Observers (if any):

None

Bidders' Representatives: As noted below per bidder.

Mr. M. Abdullah	- Roofline
Mr. Hannan Ahmed	- Roofline
Mr. Kashif Mabli	- Muhammad Arslan Naeem
Mr. Rizwan Yousaf	- Muhammad Arslan Naeem
Mr. Omer Farooqi	- On Demand Procure SMC Pvt. Ltd.
Mr. Shahid Ahmed	- Vertex Engineering
Mr. Ibrahim Kamel	- DevPro Contractors
Mr. Hassan Mahmood	- DevPro Contractors
Mr. Syed Mubashir Shah	- Expert Search
Mr. Mohsin Shazhad	- Goldroof
Mr. Emman Farooqi	-BuildFast Countrywide Pvt. Ltd.

Other Embassy staff (if any):

Mr. Shujaat Ali Umer	- local hire(translator)

III. Bids Received on Time

Upon request of the Chair, the bidders that submitted within the deadline were announced:

1. BuildFast Countrywide Pvt. Ltd.

2. Mohammed Arslan Naeem
3. Solution Technical Services
4. Nouman and Brothers
5. On-Demand Procure SMC Pvt. Ltd.
6. Vertex Engineering
7. DevPro Contractors
8. Facility Management Associates
9. 3J Solutions
10. Roofline

IV. Opening and Examination of Bids (Two-Envelope System)

The BAC/TWG examined submissions in the order opened. Salient findings are summarized below based on the checklist and the TOR requirements (scope across six sites; services/methodology; identification/assessment of leakages and defects; preventive measures; materials; duration ≤50 calendar days after contract signing; most suitable time; warranty ≥3 years; validity; similar projects; client referrals; certifications). Financial proposals were opened **only** where allowed by RA 9184/IRR.

1) Build Fast Countrywide Pvt. Ltd.

- **Technical Envelope:**
  - Scope across all six facilities: **Compliant (Yes)**
  - Cleaning/surface preparation: **Yes**
  - Identification/assessment of leakages: **Considered Yes** (warranty/coverage stated for leaks, material defects, workmanship; supported in cover letter)
  - Repair/sealing of defects: **Yes**
  - Preventive measures & application of waterproofing: **Yes** (e.g., primer + hot bitumen; membrane with aluminum foil finish; Plasto-grip specified across sites)
  - Duration: **45 working days** (≤50 calendar days after contract signing) — **Yes**
  - Most suitable time: **Yes** (start 01 Nov; finish 15 Dec)

- Materials/substances identified (e.g., Plasto-grip RLA 400; 24×26 SWG GI; ultra chemicals): **Yes**
- Validity of quotation: **30 days — Yes**
- Warranty: **3 years — Yes**
- Maintenance: **1 year — Yes**
- Similar projects / Client referrals / Certifications: **Yes** (in company profile)

→ **Technical Result: PASSED**

- **Financial Envelope:**
  - Total cost/breakdown present: **Yes**
  - **Terms of payment: Non-compliant** — no agreement to **at least 15% advance payment upon contract signing** as required.

  → **Financial Result: FAILED (disqualified on terms of payment).**

2) Muhammad Arslan Naeem

- **Submission:** Only **one envelope** received; not separated/labeled into Technical and Financial as required.

  → **Result: FAILED** at envelope check.

3) Solution Technical Services

- **Submission:** Two envelopes labeled Financial and Technical; a separate "Price Proposal" was also present and treated as Financial, but only Technical and Financial were considered.

- **Technical:**
  - Scope across six sites; cleaning; identification/assessment; repair/sealing; preventive measures; application; duration (45 days); working hours (8–5); warranty (≥3 years): **marked present**
  - **Materials:** only **generic** ("membrane, sealants, coatings"); **specific materials not identified — Non-compliant**
  - **Similar projects:** stated "available on demand"; **no list/attachments — Non-compliant**

  → **Result: FAILED (incomplete Technical).** Financial not opened.

4) Nouman and Brothers

- **Submission:** Only **one unlabeled envelope**; contents not split into Technical/Financial nor labeled.
  → **Result: FAILED** at envelope check.

5) On-Demand Procure SMC Pvt. Ltd.

- **Submission:** Two envelopes (Technical and Financial). **Financial envelope was accidentally cut during opening; not examined.**

- **Technical:** Scope listed only **four (4)** areas (Chancery/Main Office, Ambassador's Residence, Recreation Center, "ATM center"); **Guardhouse and Driver's Lounge missing**.
  → **Result: FAILED (incomplete scope).** Financial **not** evaluated.

6) Vertex Engineering

- **Submission:** Two envelopes (Technical and Financial).

- **Technical:** No clear **scope**, contractual obligations, or services; completed projects mentioned but **no client references**; overall **incomplete**.
  → **Result: FAILED (incomplete Technical).** Financial not opened.

7) DevPro Contractors

- **Submission:** Two envelopes (Technical and Financial).

- **Technical:** Scope across six sites; cleaning; problem identification; repair/sealing; preventive measures; roof treatment; timeline/most suitable time; materials; validity; warranty: **present**
  • **Client references: Absent**
  • **Relevant certifications: Absent**
  → **Result: FAILED (missing references/certifications).** Financial not opened.

8) Facility Management Associates

- **Submission:** Two envelopes (Technical and Financial).

- **Technical:** Could not establish explicit scope covering **all six** facilities; **scope not found**.
  → **Result: FAILED (incomplete Technical).** Financial not opened.

9) 3J Solutions

- **Submission:** Company profile **not in sealed envelopes** as required.
  → **Result: FAILED** (non-compliant submission format).

10) Roofline

- **Submission:** Two envelopes (Technical and Financial).

- **Technical:**
  • Scope across six areas: **Yes**
  • Methodology/services, identification/assessment of leakages; repair/sealing: **Yes**
  • Preventive measures: representative stated **groove-making and securing membrane**; noted for the record
  • Materials: **identified**
  • **Project duration/timeline & most suitable time: Not indicated** (no dates/period) — **Non-compliant**
  → **Result: FAILED (no most suitable time/timeline).** Financial not opened.

V. Consolidated Results

- **Technically Responsive Bidders: None.** *(Build Fast Countrywide passed Technical but **failed Financial** on terms of payment.)*

- **Financial Proposals Opened:**
  • **Build Fast Countrywide** — opened and **failed** (no agreement to ≥15% advance upon contract signing).
  • **On-Demand Procure** — financial envelope was **accidentally snipped** during handling; **no examination** was made.

- **All other Financial Envelopes: Not opened** pursuant to Section 30.1 of the IRR (financial bid of a bidder that fails Technical shall not be opened).

VI. Return of Financial Envelopes

The BAC directed the Secretariat to **return unopened financial envelopes** to the respective non-compliant bidders immediately after the session, with acknowledgment of receipt. This was carried out at the venue before adjournment.

VII. BAC Determination and Declaration

After completion of the opening and preliminary examination, the BAC **unanimously determined** that there were **no responsive bids**. Pursuant to **Section 35.1** in relation to **Section 30.1** of the 2016 Revised IRR of RA 9184 and the **DFA Procurement Manual**, the BAC **declares a FAILURE OF BIDDING** for the project.

VIII. Directives / Next Steps

1. The **BAC Secretariat** is directed to prepare and route for signatures the **Abstract of Bids**, these **Minutes of Opening of Bids**, and the **BAC Resolution** declaring Failure of Bidding for submission to the **Head of Post** for approval and appropriate action, including conduct of **re-bidding**.

2. In accordance with **Section 35.2** of the IRR, **re-advertisement/posting** for the re-bidding shall be undertaken **within seven (7) calendar days** from the date of this declaration of failure of bidding.

3. The Secretariat/TWG will refine the bidding documents for re-bidding, including issuing a **prescribed Technical Proposal form/checklist** to guide bidders in fully addressing scope, timeline/most suitable time, materials, references, and certifications.

IX. Adjournment

There being no other matters, the Chair declared the proceedings **formally closed at 10:53 a.m.** The BAC thanked all participants and observers for their attendance and cooperation and informed bidders that they will be notified regarding the **re-bidding**.