

MODULE 6 | PURCHASING, TENDERS, SUPPLIERS AND CONTRACTS

Receiving, Opening and Evaluating Bids

Practical hospital governance in Punjab, Pakistan

Apply the published requirements fairly.
Make every evaluation decision traceable.

AUTHOR

Dr Qurban Hussain Khan

15

LECTURE

Make the evaluation understandable and defensible

For the Medical Superintendent (MS): oversee a fair process and understand the evidence behind the recommendation.

- Protect bids until the proper opening stage.
- Apply the published requirements consistently.
- Compare only bids qualified for consideration.
- Publish a reasoned report and complete the required checks.

OFFICIAL SOURCE

A principle tied to a named law, rule or official manual.

WORKING METHOD

A practical control or teaching format to adapt to the authorised system.

TEACHING CASE

An invented hospital example. Amounts are for learning, not spending authority.

Study output

An opening record, evaluation matrix and reasoned evaluation report.

Module 6 | Presentation 3 of 6. Allow 45-60 minutes with exercises. All explanations are on the pages; check the cited sources before live use.

Know which evaluation rules apply

This lecture concentrates on ordinary procurement of goods, works and non-consultancy services under the Punjab rules.

Start with the actual procurement

- Find the invitation date, bidding documents, approved procedure, applicable notifications and authorised electronic route.
- Rule 32(3) links an opened bid to the rules, regulations and policies in force when the invitation was issued.

Identify special cases

- Consultancy selection has separate provisions. Rule 38A also permits specified procurement under a Government notification using rule 45.
- Do not import a federal rule, a consultancy scoring system or a special notification into an ordinary Punjab tender without a valid basis.

The cited source is the official compilation amended through 24 September 2025. Check later changes and their application to the live case.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 32(3), 38, 38A; ch. VII

Separate the questions that evaluation must answer

A supplier may be capable, yet offer a product that does not meet this particular tender.

Question	Plain meaning	Typical evidence
Eligibility	May this bidder participate under the applicable conditions?	Legal identity and applicable participation restrictions.
Qualification	Can this bidder carry out the contract?	The specified experience, resources and capacity.
Responsiveness	Does this bid meet the declared requirements for consideration?	Submitted offer, specifications and mandatory conditions.
Evaluated cost	What is the comparison result under the published method?	Price and the stated, permitted evaluation adjustments.

These working distinctions help organise the file. Use the exact legal requirements and definitions that govern the procurement.

Sources: **F8**: r. 2(v), (aa); rr. 18, 25, 31-32

Fix the process before bids arrive

The submission route, closing time, opening arrangements and evaluation criteria must already be clear to bidders.

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | Confirm the route | Use the published submission instructions and the applicable Punjab e-procurement directions. |
| 2 | Assign custody | Identify who may receive bids, use system accounts and access the unopened material. |
| 3 | Prepare the record | Record tender identity, bidder identity, receipt time and the required package or system reference. |
| 4 | Preserve evidence | Keep the original bid, system records, authorised notices and subsequent communications. |

This is a working control sequence. The authorised electronic process must preserve the applicable legal safeguards.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 24-25, 30, 65 | **E1**: implementation directions

Protect the closing time and the original submission

Rule 24 requires a clear method of submission and receipt and protection against premature disclosure.

On-time submissions

- Use the prescribed official receipt or system record to establish when a bid was submitted.
- Keep unopened bids secure. In a two-envelope process, protect the financial proposal until its authorised opening stage.

Late submissions or system problems

- Rule 30(4) requires late bids to be rejected and returned unopened. Apply this through the authorised submission system.
- Record a reported system fault and follow the applicable official process. Do not privately accept a late bid or backdate its receipt.

A general extension of the submission deadline follows rule 29, including recorded reasons and notice in the manner of the original advertisement.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 24, 29-30, 38(2)(a)

An opening record is not an award decision

Opening establishes what was received and opened. Detailed evaluation follows the declared procedure.

Control	What the cited rules require	What to record
Date and time	Opening on the submission closing date, at least 30 minutes after closing.	Published closing and opening times; actual opening time.
Public opening	Bidders or representatives may choose to attend.	Attendance sheet and opening minutes.
Price disclosure	Read unit prices and bid amounts when opening the relevant price proposals.	Amounts actually read; preserve original documents.
Separate envelopes	Open only the proposal permitted at that stage.	Technical opening now; financial custody and later opening.

Read rule 30 with the selected procedure in rule 38. A technical opening does not authorise early opening of a sealed financial proposal.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 30, 38(2)(a)

Follow single-stage, two-envelope bidding in order

Rule 38(2)(a): the technical proposal and financial proposal are separate parts of one bid.

- | | | |
|----------|---|---|
| 1 | Open technical proposals | Keep financial proposals unopened in the procuring agency's custody. |
| 2 | Evaluate the technical offer | Use the criteria fixed in advance, without reference to price. Do not permit technical amendments. |
| 3 | Approve and open eligible prices | After technical evaluation and approval, publicly open accepted financial proposals on the notified date within validity. |
| 4 | Complete the comparison | Apply the published financial method and identify the lowest evaluated responsive bid. |

Retain non-responsive bidders' financial proposals unopened; return them under the grievance-period and complaint conditions in rule 38(2)(a)(vii).

Sources: **F8**: r. 38(2)(a)

Do not confuse one stage with two stages

A second envelope is not a second stage. The legal procedure determines when revisions are permitted.

Procedure	Basic structure	Important distinction
Single stage, one envelope	One bid opened at the prescribed opening.	Ordinary main method for works and standard goods.
Single stage, two envelopes	Technical evaluation first; accepted prices later.	No technical amendments during evaluation.
Two stage	Initial technical proposals; permitted discussions; revised final bids.	Rule 38(2)(b) specifies the grounds and revision process.
Two stage, two envelopes	Technical discussion; revised technical and supplementary price proposals.	Follow the specific sequence in rule 38(2)(c).

Permitted revisions in a properly selected two-stage procedure do not allow informal rewriting of a single-stage bid.

Sources: **F8**: r. 38(1)-(2)

Keep bid validity under active control

Validity is the period during which the bid remains available for acceptance under its terms.

Plan early	Track the original expiry date, evaluation work, report period, complaints and approval time.
Exceptional extension	Rule 28 requires written reasons and a request to all bidders. Obtain the required prior approval from the authority next above.
Autonomous body	If its chief executive is the competent authority, the next higher authority is the board, syndicate or other apex body.
Bidder response	An agreeing bidder extends the security and cannot change the bid's substance. A refusing bidder may withdraw without security forfeiture.
Limit and award	The extension cannot exceed the original validity period or 180 days, whichever is greater. Award must remain within valid bid validity.

Do not treat an expired offer as live or assume that a committee can extend validity on its own.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 28, 55

Prepare the evaluation team and evidence file

Working controls for a technical and financial evaluation that can be independently reviewed.

01 Authority

Keep the valid committee order and assigned functions.

02 Expertise

Use competent technical input for the actual goods or works.

03 Interests

Record and resolve conflicts through the authorised process.

04 Source set

Use the issued tender, amendments and original submitted bids.

05 Consistency

Use one criterion and evidence standard for every bidder.

06 Record

Record findings, disagreements, clarifications and signatures.

An MS should check the quality of the process and the evidence. A senior title cannot replace a required technical assessment.

WORKING METHOD | Illustrative material is identified in the text.

Check the bidder's identity and capacity

Use the eligibility and qualification requirements that actually apply; do not invent a new test after opening.

Apply the declared requirements

- Match the bidder, authorised signatory, relevant legal status and specified qualification documents to the submitted offer.
- Where procurement was prequalified, check the applicable prequalification result and current conditions.

Act on a verified concern

- Rule 18 permits further capacity information where there are credible reasons or initial evidence of a defect, even for a prequalified contractor.
- Rule 19 requires disqualification for false, fabricated or materially incorrect information. Record the evidence and the applicable decision process.

Rejecting a bid and blacklisting a supplier are separate actions. Lecture 18 explains the additional grievance and blacklisting processes.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 17-21, 25, 31-32

Tie each technical finding to a written requirement

Responsive means qualified for consideration under the declared evaluation criteria and bidding document.

Requirement	Evidence to inspect	Reasoned finding
Mandatory feature	Offered model and its submitted technical evidence.	Meets or does not meet the named criterion, with page reference.
Required licence	Valid document covering the actual activity or product.	Scope and validity established, or a specific defect identified.
Delivery / warranty	The bid's firm commitment against the stated terms.	Compliant commitment or an identified conflicting condition.
Required test	The declared test method and recorded result.	Pass or fail against the published threshold.

A personal preference for a brand or an extra feature is not a published evaluation criterion.

Sources: **F8**: r. 2(aa); rr. 25, 31-34

Use samples and demonstrations fairly

A demonstration can test a stated requirement. It cannot create a different competition after bids are opened.

Where required by the tender

- Follow the declared submission, testing and acceptance method. Apply the same conditions and record results for each bidder.
- Link the tested sample or equipment model to the item actually offered in the bid.

If evidence is unclear

- Consider whether a written clarification can explain the existing offer without changing its substance.
- Do not accept a replacement model or a new technical promise that repairs a non-responsive single-stage offer.

This working approach applies rules 31-33 and, for single-stage two-envelope evaluation, rule 38(2)(a)(v).

Sources: **F8**: rr. 31-33, 38(2)(a)

Clarification must explain the bid, not replace it

Rule 33 permits written clarification that leaves the substance unchanged. Request and response must both be in writing.

Situation	Permissible direction	Boundary
Unclear reference	Ask which part of the submitted evidence answers the stated requirement.	Do not invite a new product or changed offer.
Document inconsistency	Seek an explanation of the existing submission.	Do not invent a permission to cure every missing mandatory item.
Commercial condition	Establish what the original bid actually says.	Do not invite a new price, delivery promise or warranty to obtain compliance.
Two-stage process	Use revisions expressly permitted by the selected rule 38 procedure.	Do not call that process ordinary single-stage clarification.

Assess the actual defect under the rules and issued document. Record why the response does or does not change the bid's substance.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 33, 38

Put prices on the same declared basis

Only use the comparison basis provided in the issued bidding documents and applicable rules.

01 Quantity and unit

Compare the required quantity and the same pack, piece or unit.

02 Scope

Check delivery, installation, training and other required inclusions.

03 Tax basis

Apply the stated tax-inclusive or tax-exclusive comparison correctly.

04 Currency

Use the specified currency and rule 32(2) conversion basis where relevant.

05 Adjustments

Apply only the permitted, disclosed evaluation adjustments.

06 Result

Keep the calculation and identify the responsive lowest evaluated bid.

A price comparison is incomplete if one offer omits a required cost that the other includes.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 25, 31-32, 55

Deal with arithmetic errors through the stated method

Do not invent a correction rule after seeing which bidder would benefit.

Check the original figures

- Recalculate quantity times unit price, line totals, discounts, taxes and the grand total.
- Preserve the bid as submitted. Keep a separate calculation sheet showing each discrepancy.

Apply the permitted treatment

- Find the arithmetic-correction provision in the applicable bidding document and follow its order of precedence and required response.
- If the documents do not resolve the issue, obtain a recorded legal or procurement assessment. Do not bargain a new price.

An arithmetic correction under the applicable terms is different from allowing a bidder to revise its offer. Record the basis for the distinction.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 25, 31-33, 57

Use whole-life cost only through a disclosed method

Invented case: both bids meet all requirements. Assume the lawful, published method adds purchase price and three years of specified consumables.

Method	Compare purchase price + 3 x annual consumable cost. The same quantity, scope and tax basis apply.
Bid A	PKR 4.0 million + (3 x PKR 1.0 million) = PKR 7.0 million.
Bid B	PKR 4.6 million + (3 x PKR 0.7 million) = PKR 6.7 million.
Result	Bid B has the lower evaluated cost in this example, although its initial purchase price is higher.
Limit	The figures are fictional, with no discounting in this simplified method. A live method must define all assumptions in advance.

Do not add maintenance costs, energy estimates or quality scores after opening merely to change the ranking.

Sources: F8: r. 2(v), (ae); rr. 31-32

Start with the published conditions, not the prices

Invented single-stage, one-envelope tender for 50 monitors. Assume these are lawful, published requirements and all other checks are satisfied.

Required feature	Every monitor must have Feature X. The bid must establish that the offered model includes it.
Bid A	PKR 4.00 million for all 50 units. Submitted offer explicitly excludes Feature X.
Bid B	PKR 4.40 million. Submitted evidence confirms Feature X and all other required conditions.
Bid C	PKR 4.55 million. Submitted evidence confirms Feature X and all other required conditions.
Price method	Among responsive bids, compare the complete price on the same stated tax and delivery basis. No further adjustment applies.

The monitor type, feature and prices are teaching assumptions. They are not suggested specifications or actual market prices.

Explain why the lowest quoted price does not win

Continue the invented case. The committee applies the criteria that were issued to every bidder.

Bid	Finding	Evaluation result
A PKR 4.00m	Required Feature X is expressly excluded.	Non-responsive. Do not rank it as the winning compliant bid.
B PKR 4.40m	Meets the stated requirements.	Lowest evaluated responsive bid in this example.
C PKR 4.55m	Meets the stated requirements.	Responsive, but PKR 0.15m above B.

The recommendation is B, subject to the remaining legal, funding, report, complaint and award checks. A cannot repair its offer by adding Feature X afterwards.

Sources: **F8**: r. 2(v), (aa); rr. 31-33, 55

Build an evaluation matrix that shows the evidence

Working format. Use as many rows as the actual criteria require; link the full supporting record.

Criterion / source	Bid A evidence	Bid B evidence	Finding and reason
Mandatory feature tender 4.2	Bid p. 8: excluded.	Bid p. 11: included.	A fails this requirement; B meets it.
Delivery tender 5.1	Bid p. 9: meets period.	Bid p. 12: meets period.	Both meet this requirement.
Price method tender 7.3	PKR 4.00m; non-responsive.	PKR 4.40m; responsive.	Do not rank A as an eligible winner.
Clarifications file reference	Any written request and reply.	Any written request and reply.	State whether the original offer remains unchanged.

Use actual clause numbers and evidence. This two-bid extract illustrates the format; the complete case matrix must also include Bid C.

Write a report that explains acceptance and rejection

Rule 37 requires an evaluation report with reasons. A list of prices and a signature page is insufficient.

01 Procurement

Tender reference, item or lot, procedure and relevant dates.

02 Participation

Bids received, bids opened and late bids, with their status.

03 Published tests

The actual eligibility, technical and price criteria applied.

04 Findings

A reason and evidence reference for each material decision.

05 Comparison

Responsive bids, calculations, adjustments and final ranking.

06 Recommendation

The proposed outcome, unresolved matters and approvals needed.

Record technical approval where required. Preserve the complete signed evaluation record and the version actually announced.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 31-33, 37, 38, 65

Keep the report period and complaint periods distinct

These rules serve different purposes. An early technical report does not replace the report required before award.

Event	Cited requirement	Practical control
Evaluation report	Rule 37: announce reasons for acceptance or rejection at least 10 days before award.	Record the announcement date and the earliest lawful award point.
Technical grievance	Rule 67: complaint within 5 days of the technical report announcement.	Preserve the detailed report and receipt dates.
Final-report grievance	Rule 67: complaint within 10 days after final report issuance.	Identify the permitted grounds and the applicable procedure.
Further action	Comply with complaint decisions and any suspension or court order.	Do not treat elapsed time alone as clearance to award.

Lecture 18 explains grievances, their permitted scope and further representations. The 5-day technical window is not a substitute for rule 37.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 37, 67, 67A

One complying bid does not automatically mean failure

Rule 55A permits award where one complying bid is received, subject to rule 35. It does not require automatic award.

Before recommending award

- Confirm that participation and evaluation were lawful and the bid actually complies with the published requirements.
- Check validity, funding, authority and value for money. Record the evidence supporting the recommendation.

If the outcome is unacceptable

- The procuring agency retains the rule 35 power to reject all bids before acceptance.
- Assess the actual problem and the lawful next step. Do not accept non-compliance merely because only one bidder remains.

One complying bid and direct contracting are different situations. Do not rewrite the procurement route after the result is known.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 4, 35, 55-55A

Reject or restart only through the proper rule

A weak response requires a reasoned decision. Re-tendering is not a way to avoid an inconvenient lawful result.

Rejection of all bids

- Rule 35 permits rejection before acceptance. Inform bidders promptly and communicate grounds on request.
- Keep the approval, facts and reasons in the file. The power to reject does not remove other legal duties.

Restarting or fresh bidding

- Rule 35(5) permits restarting from a prior stage only with recorded reasons and without violating rule 4 principles; immediately inform bidders.
- Rule 36 requires assessment of why bids were rejected before fresh bidding, with revisions where needed.

Do not silently add a missing criterion to the current evaluation. Use the lawful corrective route and preserve equal treatment.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 4, 35-36

Keep clarification separate from negotiation

The committee cannot call in favoured bidders to bargain a different competitive outcome.

Ordinary evaluation

- Rule 57 generally prohibits negotiation except where the rules provide otherwise.
- Its proviso permits acceptance of a voluntary discount from the lowest evaluated bidder. This is not permission for informal price bargaining.

Special procedures

- Consultancy negotiations and the narrow highly technical goods provisions have their own conditions.
- Use those provisions only when the actual procurement falls within them. Record the exact legal basis and approved process.

A cheaper informal offer obtained after opening cannot replace the published competitive evaluation.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 33, 53, 57

Protect confidentiality and retain the complete record

Transparency requires the right information at the right stage, with a record that can be checked later.

During evaluation

- Rule 58 requires bid evaluation information to remain confidential until the report is announced.
- Restrict access, preserve submitted documents and route bidder communications through the authorised process.

After report and award

- Publish the required report. Rule 66 requires public access to evaluation and award documents after award, subject to its limited exception process.
- Rule 65 sets a minimum five-year procurement record period. Check other retention duties and preserve material needed for live disputes or audits.

Do not privately share a competitor's prices or draft findings. Do not erase earlier versions to make the file appear consistent.

Sources: **F8**: rr. 37, 58, 65-66

Review the handover before award

Working review for the MS and competent authority. Lecture 16 covers supplier checks and contract setup.

01 Complete evaluation

Every bid has a recorded status and supporting reason.

02 Correct result

The calculation follows the published comparison method.

03 Valid process

Opening, clarifications and required approvals are documented.

04 Required periods

Report and grievance steps are complete; orders are complied with.

05 Live authority

Bid validity, funding and competent award authority are confirmed.

06 Clear handover

Carry the accepted scope, price, delivery and obligations into the contract.

A recommendation is not a contract. The authorised award and contract steps must still be completed.

Choose the lawful next step

Write your answer and the reason before turning to the next page.

1 | Missing feature

The cheapest single-stage bid excludes a mandatory feature. The bidder now offers to add it at the same price.

Can the committee accept the new promise?

2 | One compliant offer

Three bids arrive. Two fail published requirements and one complies. Staff say a fresh tender is always compulsory.

Is that an accurate statement of rule 55A?

3 | Hidden running cost

After opening, the committee decides to add five years of energy cost. The tender contained no such formula.

Can the new calculation decide the winner?

Write the applicable principle, the evidence to preserve and the next decision needed.

Answers and reasons

Use the evidence, the calculation and the actual source of authority.

1 | No informal repair of a single-stage offer

The new feature changes the submitted offer. Apply rules 31-33 and the selected procedure; record the original non-compliance. A prescribed two-stage revision is a different process.

2 | No automatic duty to re-tender

Rule 55A permits award of a single complying bid subject to rule 35. Confirm compliance, value for money and all other award conditions; do not assume that award is compulsory.

3 | No new evaluation formula after opening

Use the criteria that were issued. A later energy-cost formula cannot change this ranking. If a defect prevents a lawful outcome, seek the proper rule 35-36 corrective decision.

The answer must connect the rule to the facts. Avoid slogans such as "always buy cheapest" or "always re-tender".

Sources: **F8**: rr. 31-36, 38, 55A

Prepare a small evaluation file

Use a non-confidential real case or the invented examples in this lecture.

1 | Opening record

List bids, receipt times, opening events and the custody record.

2 | Evaluation matrix

Map each criterion to bid evidence, finding and calculation.

3 | Report and dates

Draft the reasons, recommendation and report/complaint timeline.

Reviewer's question: could another authorised officer reproduce the result from the original documents?

Next: Lecture 16: Selecting Suppliers and Awarding Contracts.

Sources and continued use

Select a source title or its official-source link to open the document.

F8

Punjab Procurement Rules 2014

Official compilation amended through 24 September 2025. Rule references identify the legal basis of the lesson. Read with later notifications and the current orders applicable to the procurement.

Punjab Procurement Regulatory Authority | [Official source](#) | [Notifications](#)

E1

Punjab e-procurement implementation directions

Official PPRA collection, including implementation directions effective from 1 July 2024 for the bodies covered by those directions. Check the live authorised platform and applicable instructions.

Punjab Procurement Regulatory Authority | [Official source](#)

Educational material by Dr Qurban Hussain Khan. Source editions are stated; verify later amendments and applicable institutional orders before live use.