

No. 3155-55 /CE/MEPCO/CE(CSD)/PA/

Dated: 24/08/2026

Chief Engineer (Dev) PMU
MEPCO Multan

Subject: REPORT OF GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE AS PER PPRA RULE CLAUSE-48 (2) ON GRIEVANCE SUBMITTED BY M/S W.S. & CO. AGAINST CERTAIN CLAUSES OF THE BIDDING DOCUMENTS OF MEPCO TENDER NO. PMU 23/2026-27 FOR SUPPLY OF 132KV SPA POLES REFERENCE NO. P79327, TENDER NO. PMU 24/2026-27 FOR SUPPLY OF 132KV SPG POLES REFERENCE NO. P79354, TENDER NO. PMU 25/2026-27 FOR SUPPLY OF BOLTS AND TEMPLATES FOR SPA, SPD AND SPG POLES REFERENCE NO. P79354.


Ref:

- Grievance of M/S W S & Co vide letter No WSC/MEPCO-SPA-01/GRC dated 12 08 2026 and on EPAD dated 12 08 2026
- CE (CSD) MEPCO letter No. 3105-11/CE/MEPCO/CSD/PA/ dated 12 08 2026
- Chief Engineer (Dev) PMU MEPCO letter No. 676/Proc dated 29 07 2026.
- Hearing Conducted on dated 18 08 2026 in the office of CE (CSD)

The Grievance Redressal Committee (GRC) has examined the grievance submitted by M/S W.S. & Co. against certain clauses of the bidding documents of MEPCO Tender No. PMU-23/2026-27, Tender No PMU-24/2026-27 and Tender No PMU-25/2026-27 separately under Rule 48(2) of the Public Procurement Rules, 2004 (amended to date), and conclusion is tabulated below.

Tender No PMU-23/2026-27	Tender No PMU-24/2026-27	Tender No PMU-25/2026-27
- GRC does not agree with the complainant firm's stance regarding deletion of the "expression "or higher rating" - Procuring department is advised to amend the Clause 16.3(iii) and add after the field formations in clause 16.3(iii) as "if the performance report of offer equipment installed in MEPCO shall be taken internally, then same shall be shared with the concerned bidder by the procuring department and the bidder shall be given Seven (07) days to raise its concern and these concern shall be resolved by the procuring department or shall be evaluated by evaluation committee" - The GRC does not find sufficient basis to make mandatory reconciliation of audited financial statements with FBR tax returns, as the complainant firm did not pointed out any provision from the procurement regulatory framework, being violated in the above case. - The procuring department should incorporate unambiguous verification mechanism of documents required as per clause 16.3(ii) and 16.4	- GRC does not agree with the complainant firm's stance regarding deletion of the expression "or higher rating" - Procuring department is advised to amend the Clause 16.3(iii) and add after the field formations in clause 16.3(iii) as "if the performance report of offer equipment installed in MEPCO shall be taken internally, then same shall be shared with the concerned bidder by the procuring department and the bidder shall be given Seven (07) days to raise its concern and these concern shall be resolved by the procuring department or shall be evaluated by evaluation committee" - The GRC does not find sufficient basis to make mandatory reconciliation of audited financial statements with FBR tax returns, as the complainant firm did not pointed out any provision from the procurement regulatory framework, being violated in the above case. - The procuring department should incorporate unambiguous verification mechanism of documents required as per clause 16.3(ii) and 16.4	- GRC does not agree with the complainant firm's stance regarding deletion of the expression "or higher rating" - Procuring department is advised to amend the Clause 16.3(iii) and add after the field formations in clause 16.3(iii) as "if the performance report of offer equipment installed in MEPCO shall be taken internally, then same shall be shared with the concerned bidder by the procuring department and the bidder shall be given Seven (07) days to raise its concern and these concern shall be resolved by the procuring department or shall be evaluated by evaluation committee" - The GRC does not find sufficient basis to make mandatory reconciliation of audited financial statements with FBR tax returns, as the complainant firm did not pointed out any provision from the procurement regulatory framework, being violated in the above case. - The procuring department should incorporate unambiguous verification mechanism of documents required as per clause 16.3(ii) and 16.4 - The procurement department should issue clarification regarding points raised in tender No PMU 25/2026-27 (point f in prayer of the complainant firm vide letter No WSC/MEPCO-BT-01 GRC dated 12-08-2026) regarding compatibility of bolts, nuts and templates with poles of approved manufacturers and the allocation of responsibility for structural failure attributable to such components

DA/Detail Report


Chief Engineer (CSD)
MEPCO Ltd Multan

(Convenor of Grievance Committee)

CC to:

- Chief Financial Officer, MEPCO H/Q Multan (Member)
- Chief Technical Services MEPCO H/Q Multan
- Manager (CM & RA) MIRAD MEPCO Multan (Member)
- Manager (Proc.) PMU MEPCO Multan
- M/S W S & Co