



**ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT &
MANAGEMENT COMPANY**
**OFFICE NO. 103, FIRST FLOOR, EVACUEE TRUST COMPLEX,
ISLAMABAD**

PROCUREMENT

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Name of Procuring Agency: | Energy Infrastructure Development & Management Company |
| 2. Method of Procurement: | Single Stage – Two Envelope |
| 3. Title of Procurement: | Hiring of Headhunting Firm |
| 4. Tender Enquiry No.: | EIDMC/PROC/RFP/25-26/01 |
| 5. PPRA Ref. No.: | TS0000008497E |
| 6. Date and Time of Closing: | 11:00 AM, 10 July 2026 |
| 7. Date and Time of Opening: | 11:30 AM, 10 July 2026 |
| 8. No. of Bids Received: | 01 |
| 9. Criteria for RFP Evaluation: | As mentioned in RFP Document |
| 10. Details of Technical Evaluation: | |

HIRING OF HEADHUNTING AUDITOR FIRM

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder M/s	Technical Marks	Remarks / Ranking
1	Sidat Hyder Morshed Associates (Pvt) Ltd	0	Technically Non-Responsive i. Incomplete RFP Submission: The RFP submitted by the firm was incomplete in material respects. ii. Non-Compliance with Clause 3.15.1 (Section 3: Instructions to Consultants): The Clause requires that the uploaded bid be complete in all respects, with each page duly signed and stamped. However, M/s Sidat Hyder uploaded only 31 pages on the EPADS version, comprising only the following sections: - Company Profile - Experience of the Firm - Key Management and Staff - Mandatory Eligibility Criteria - Description of Approach, Methodology & Work Plan



**ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT &
MANAGEMENT COMPANY**
**OFFICE NO. 103, FIRST FLOOR, EVACUEE TRUST COMPLEX,
ISLAMABAD**

PROCUREMENT

			Notably, the original RFP document uploaded by the Procuring Agency — which was required to be signed and stamped by the Consultant or its duly authorized representative(s) — was not included as part of the bid. iii. Non-Compliance with Clause 3.8.1 (Section 3) and Clause 4.1 (Section 4 – Mandatory Criteria): These clauses required the firm to fill out all 16 Forms of Proposal contained in Section 5 of the original RFP. The firm submitted only 4 out of the 16 required forms. iv. Failure to Provide Mandatory Documents (Clause 4.1, Section 4): Instead of submitting the actual documents required under the Mandatory Criteria, the firm provided only a checklist of mandatory requirements, without the supporting documentation itself. v. Missing Documentation for Technical Evaluation (Section 5 and Clause 4.2.1, Section 4): The firm failed to attach the necessary documents and details required under Section 5 (Forms of Proposal) and Clause 4.2.1 (Technical Evaluation), which are essential for the award of technical marks.
--	--	--	--

**Deputy Director (Procurement)
EIDMC Islamabad**