GOVERNMENT OF GILGIT- BALTISTAN
GILGIT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (GDA)
Yadgar Chowk, Khomer, Gilgit.
Ph: 05811-922307 , Fax: 05811922518

No.GDA-TECH-4(69)/2026 Dated: 2nd November, 2026

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE (GRC)

Project	Construction of Water Supply Scheme for Gilgit City
Procuring Agency	Gilgit Development Authority (GDA)
Date of Bid Opening	02-09-2026
Technical Proposal Evaluation Report Announced	16-10-2026
Period of Receipt of Complaints	20-10-2026 to 23-10-2026
Date of GRC Constitution Notification	17-08-2026
Date(s) of GRC Proceedings	28-10-2026

1. INTRODUCTION

The Grievance Redressal Committee (GRC) of the Gilgit Development Authority (GDA) convened to examine complaints submitted by bidders against the technical evaluation of bids for the project titled "Construction of Water Supply Scheme for Gilgit City."

The bids were opened on 02-09-2026, and the Technical Proposal Evaluation Report was announced on 16-10-2026. Five bidders subsequently submitted complaints during the period from 20-10-2026 to 23-10-2026, challenging various aspects of the technical evaluation.

The GRC examined the complaints, the grounds of disqualification or marks awarded, the responses of the Procurement Committee, and the relevant documents and records made available for consideration. The Committee deliberated on each complaint separately and recorded its findings and decisions as detailed below.

2. SUMMARY OF COMPLAINTS

Sr. No.	Complainant	Principal Ground of Complaint
1	M/s Fazal Akbar JV M/s Abdul Jalal	Non-authentication of JV Agreement and audit reports; dispute regarding the claimed joint venture and authorization.
2	M/s Aurangzeb & Sons Construction Company	Non-authentication of audit report and lack of qualifying completed similar work involving HDPE pipes of 12 inches or above diameter.
3	Peshawar Construction & Pipes JV Mushtaq Ali Govt Contractor	Non-authentication of audit report and failure of JV partner to meet the minimum 25% qualifying criteria.

4	HASAS Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Non-completion of a project involving HDPE pipes of 12 inches or above diameter.
5	ZAKI & WASI Associates and Builders Pvt. Ltd.	Disagreement with marks awarded under the annual turnover criterion and failure to obtain the minimum passing score of 70%.

3. EXAMINATION OF INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS

3.1. M/S FAZAL AKBAR JV M/S ABDUL JALAL

Ground of Complaint

The bidder challenged the decision of the Procurement Committee regarding non-responsiveness of its bid on account of non-authentication of the JV Agreement and audit reports. The complainant maintained that M/s Fazal Akbar had issued a Power of Attorney in favour of M/s Abdul Jalal and that the relevant document had been submitted with the bidding documents.

Proceedings and Decision of the GRC

During the GRC proceedings held on 28-10-2026, the bidder withdrew its complaint/application. In view of the withdrawal, the GRC considered that no further examination of the merits of the complaint was required.

Decision: The complaint was disposed of as withdrawn by the complainant. No findings on the merits of the case were recorded.

3.2. M/S AURANGZEB & SONS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Ground of Complaint

The bidder challenged its disqualification on the grounds of non-authentication of the audit report and failure to demonstrate completed similar work involving HDPE pipes of 12 inches or above diameter. The complainant maintained that it had submitted audit reports for the preceding three years prepared by an approved audit firm. It further stated that it had executed work involving 12-inch HDPE pipes in District Ghizer and had attached the relevant start order and agreement with its bid.

Response of the Procurement Committee

The Procurement Committee stated that the audit report had been independently verified with the purported issuing firm, Clarkson Hyde Saud Ansari Chartered Accountants. In response to the Committee's verification request, the firm denied having audited the financial statements submitted by the bidder. The Committee also stated that the bidder had not provided a

completion certificate establishing that the cited similar work had been completed as required under the bidding criteria.

Examination and Findings of the GRC

- The bidder submitted an audit report purportedly prepared by Clarkson Hyde Saud Ansari Chartered Accountants.
- The Procurement Committee contacted the purported issuing accountants through email to verify the report.
- The accountants responded in writing: "**We haven't performed audit of the given financial. So We can't verify.**"
- The email correspondence and the accountants' response were made available for the record.
- The bidder submitted a start order and a completion certificate issued by the client for the cited work. However, the certificate indicated that the work was 75% complete, rather than fully completed.

The GRC observed that the audit report could not be authenticated by the purported issuing firm and that the cited work did not establish 100% completion as required by the qualifying criterion, subject to the applicable provisions of the bidding documents.

Decision of the GRC

The GRC upheld the Procurement Committee's decision to declare the bid non-responsive. The complaint was rejected.

3.3. PESHAWAR CONSTRUCTION & PIPES JV MUSHTAQ ALI GOVT CONTRACTOR

Ground of Complaint

The complainant challenged its disqualification on the grounds of non-authentication of the audit report and failure of the JV partner to meet the minimum 25% qualifying criteria. The complainant maintained that the required documents, relevant work orders and completion certificates demonstrating experience in similar projects had been submitted with the bid. It also stated that the relevant audit reports were included in the bidding documents.

Response of the Procurement Committee

The Procurement Committee stated that the audit report had been independently verified with the purported issuing firm, Clarkson Hyde Saud Ansari Chartered Accountants. The firm denied having audited the financial statements of M/s Mushtaq Ali. The Committee further stated that the JV partner did not meet the minimum 25% requirement against the qualifying

criteria specified in Paragraph 2 of the Terms of Reference. Hence further evaluation did not carried out by the committee.

Examination and Findings of the GRC

- The bidder submitted an audit report purportedly prepared by Clarkson Hyde Saud Ansari Chartered Accountants.
- The Procurement Committee emailed the purported issuing accountants for verification.
- The accountants denied having conducted the audit, stating in writing: "**We haven't performed audit of the given financial. So We can't verify.**"
- The relevant email correspondence and response of the accountants were attached to the record.
- The JV partner did not demonstrate the qualifying experience in HDPE pipe work required under the "Firm Experience" criterion. The Grievance Redressal Committee (GRC) re-examined the marking of the evaluation committee section by section.
- It was found that the firm had erroneously not been awarded marks for its general water supply project experience. After recalculation, the firm obtained 18 marks in the firm experience section, which exceeds the required 25% threshold. The Procurement committee stated that as the firm's Audit report found incorrect in section 1 of the evaluation criteria that's why further evaluation of the firm did not carried out.

Decision of the GRC

The GRC upholds decision of the Procurement Committee declaring the bid non-responsive. Although the firm's marks in the experience section have increased, the firm cannot be passed because its audit report is unauthenticated and has been disowned by the auditor firm. The complaint is rejected, subject to the applicable provisions of the bidding documents and the Procurement Rules.

3.4. HASAS CONSTRUCTION PVT. LTD.

Ground of Complaint

The bidder challenged its disqualification on the ground that it had not completed any project involving HDPE pipes of 12 inches or above diameter. The complainant contended that the Evaluation Committee had not properly considered its work experience and that the supporting documents and record submitted with the bid might not have been fully examined or appropriately assessed during the technical evaluation.

Proceedings and Decision of the GRC

During the GRC proceedings held on 26-10-2026, the bidder withdrew its complaint/application. In view of the withdrawal, the GRC considered that no further examination of the merits of the complaint was required.

Decision: The complaint was disposed of as withdrawn by the complainant. No findings on the merits of the case were recorded.

3.5. ZAKI & WASI ASSOCIATES AND BUILDERS PVT. LTD.

Ground of Complaint

The bidder challenged the marks awarded under the annual turnover criterion and maintained that it had failed to obtain the minimum passing score of 70% despite having submitted the required financial documents. The complainant referred to the approved bidding document, contending that 15 marks were allocated where annual turnover of Rs. 1 billion or above was reflected in the audited financial statements for the last three years.

The bidder stated that its turnover for the relevant period amounted to approximately Rs. 1,300 million. However, the Evaluation Committee had awarded only 6 marks against the criterion. The complainant argued that this was inconsistent with the approved evaluation criteria and requested reconsideration of the marks.

Response of the Procurement Committee

The Procurement Committee maintained that the bidder had misinterpreted the evaluation criteria. According to the Committee, the award of the full 15 marks required an annual turnover of Rs. 1 billion or above in each of the three financial years, rather than an aggregate turnover of Rs. 1 billion or above over the three-year period.

The Committee explained that the bidder had been awarded 6 marks because its annual turnover for the financial year 2025–26 met the threshold of Rs. 500 million or above. However, the bidder's reported annual turnovers for the preceding financial years were as follows:

Financial Year	Annual Turnover
2023–24	Rs. 415.99 million
2024–25	Rs. 426.93 million
2025–26	Assessed by the Procurement Committee to meet the Rs. 500 million threshold

The Committee stated that the turnovers for 2023–24 and 2024–25 were below the minimum threshold of Rs. 500 million and that the marks awarded were therefore consistent with its interpretation of the approved evaluation criteria.

Examination and Findings of the GRC

The GRC examined the bidder's contention, the Procurement Committee's explanation and the turnover criterion in the approved bidding document. The criterion awards marks by reference to "annual turnover for last 03 years" without stating that each year must separately meet the prescribed limit. The Procurement Committee's interpretation was applied inconsistently: while it required the threshold to be met in each year for the full 15 marks, it awarded 6 marks on the basis of the 2025-26 turnover alone, even though the turnover of the two preceding years was below Rs. 500 million. The clause is therefore ambiguous, and the ambiguity cannot be resolved against the bidder.

Read collectively, the bidder's audited turnover for the three years is Rs. 415.99 million, Rs. 426.93 million and Rs. 502.05 million, totaling Rs. 1344.97 million, which exceeds Rs. 1 billion. The bidder is therefore entitled to 15 marks, and with this correction its total reaches the required 70% passing score.

Decision of the GRC

The GRC accepts the complaint. The marks awarded under the annual turnover criterion are corrected from 6 to 15. The bidder is declared technically responsive, subject to verification of its audited financial statements and the applicable provisions of the bidding documents and the Procurement Rules.

4. CONSOLIDATED DECISIONS OF THE GRC

Sr. No.	Complainant	Outcome
1	M/s Fazal Akbar JV M/s Abdul Jalal	Complaint disposed of as withdrawn on 28-10-2026; no decision on the merits.
2	M/s Aurangzeb & Sons Construction Company	Complaint rejected; decision of the Procurement Committee upheld.
3	Peshawar Construction & Pipes JV Mushtaq Ali Govt Contractor	Complaint rejected; decision of the Procurement Committee upheld.
4	HASAS Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Complaint disposed of as withdrawn on 28-10-2026; no decision on the merits.
5	ZAKI & WASI Associates and Builders Pvt. Ltd.	**Complaint Accepted**; M/S Zaki & Wasi stands responsive for further tender process.

5. CONCLUSION

The GRC examined the five complaints received against the technical evaluation of bids for the project titled "Construction of Water Supply Scheme for Gilgit City." The Committee considered the arguments of the complainants, the responses of the Procurement Committee and the supporting documents made available during the proceedings.

The GRC upheld the Procurement Committee's decisions in respect of two complaints. The complaint submitted by HASAS Construction Pvt. Ltd and M/s Fazal Akbar JV M/s Abdul Jalal was disposed of as withdrawn following the bidder's withdrawal on 28-10-2026. Accordingly, no findings on the merits of that complaint were recorded. Complaint of M/S ZAKI & WASI Associates and Builders Pvt. Ltd. Has been accepted and stood responsive for further bidding process.

The decisions recorded in this report are based on the material examined during the GRC proceedings and remain subject to the applicable bidding documents and procurement rules.

Assistant Director (Accounts), GDA
(Member)

Assistant Director (Development), GDA
(Member)

Director Engineer GDA
(Chairman GRC)