



MINUTES OF MEETING

Monday, 8 April 2018	1:30 PM	Conference Room A
----------------------	---------	-------------------

MEETING CALLED BY	Bids and Awards Committee VIII
TYPE OF MEETING	Pre-Bid Conference
PROJECT	Supply and Delivery of Disaster Relief Supplies for the Office of the Office of the Civil Defense (OCD)
REFERENCE	PB No. 19-059-8
ATTENDEES	<p>Bids and Awards Committee VIII Engr. Jaime M. Navarrete, Jr. Chairperson Engr. Mark John O. Nofies Provisional Member Mr. Christopher B. Gacutan Ad Hoc Representative, OCD</p> <p>Procurement Division VIII Mr. Paul Armand A. Estrada Member Ms. Jamille Rae T. Baluyot Member</p> <p>End User’s Representatives Mr. Sonny Patron Office of the Civil Defense Ms. Leilani A. Legaspi Office of the Civil Defense</p> <p>Bidder(s) Mr. Andrew Cortez Gibrosen Ms. Lesley Salandonan King’s Safetynet Inc. Mr. John Paul Escares Macrovista Mr. John Carlo Benedicto KIRSSI Mr. Ronald Padilla Macrovista Mr. Mark Agulto Armada Ms. Rejean Barredo DVK Phil. Ms. Karla Lavarias OPEMS Mr. Evangeline Beredico Int’l Diamond ETH Mr. Randy Pagtakhan FootSafe Ms. Pearl Santos FootSafe Mr. Louis Alcongell Unimasters Conglomeration</p>
CALL TO ORDER	The scheduled Pre-Bid Conference started at 1:45 PM presided by the Chairperson.

<p>COMPLIANCE TO R.A. 9184</p>	<p>The Chairperson, upon the determination of the attendance of the majority of the Bids and Awards Committee, established quorum to conduct the Pre-Bid conference. Furthermore, the Secretariat presented the Invitation To Observers in compliance to R.A. 9184.</p>
---------------------------------------	---

DISCUSSION

I. BID DOCUMENTS

<p>INVITATION TO BID</p>	<p>Bidders requested to amend the date of the deadline for the submission and opening of bids because of the Lenten Season also to give ample time to the bidders to prepare their proposals.</p>
<p>INSTRUCTION TO BIDDERS</p>	<p>No further clarification.</p>
<p>BID DATA SHEET</p>	<p>Page 40 BDS Clause 5.4</p> <p>xxx The Bidder must have completed, within the period specified in the Invitation to Bid and ITB Clause 12.1 (a)(ii), a single contract that is similar to this Project, equivalent to at least fifty percent (50%) of the ABC for all lots.</p> <p>For this purpose, similar contracts shall refer to any contract for Personal Protective Equipment (lots 1 to 4)</p> <p>xxx</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Representative from DVK requested to be clarified if contracts under Disaster Preparedness Equipment will be acceptable. • The Representative from King’s Safetynet Inc. requested to be clarified if contracts under Emergency Response Items will be acceptable. • The Representative from International Diamond requested to be clarified if contracts for Anti-Riot Helmets are acceptable. They manifested that these items also serve as personal protective equipment. <p>➤ The Committee took note of the clarification for further discussion with the End Users. Clarifications and amendments will be clarified on the Supplemental Bid Bulletin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Representative from KIRSSI requested to be the clarified on the 50% coverage on the requirement of the SLCC. ➤ The Committee clarified that this is a four (4) lot project. It was reiterated that one contract is sufficient for all opportunities as long as it covers the 50% requirement for each lot. The bidder may repeatedly use the stated single largest contract, considering that the definition for all lots is the same.

- The Representative from King’s Safetynet Inc. requested to be clarified if a Purchase Order that is still on-going is acceptable as Single Largest Contract.
- The Representative from OPEMS requested to be clarified if an awarded project but with unpaid Purchase Order should be declared under On-going Contracts.
 - The Secretariat clarified that as long as contracts are not yet paid; they are still considered and should be declared as on-going.
 - The Committee emphasized that the prescribed form for Single Largest Contract requires date of Official Receipt.
- The Representative from FootSafe Phil. requested to be clarified if they shall also submit the proof of the single largest contract during the Opening of Bids or during the Post Qualification stage.
 - The Chairperson clarified that only the Statement of Single Largest Contract Form or the Annex C of the Bidding Documents is required. However, proof as enumerated under 29.2 of the Bid Data Sheet shall be submitted during the Post Qualification stage.
 - The Committee emphasized that the bidder is not prohibited in submitting the proof of Single Largest Contract and is not a ground for disqualification of the proposal.
- The Representative from OPEMS requested to be clarified if they must also submit supporting documents or attachments as proof for the On-Going Contracts or the form itself is acceptable.
 - The Chairperson clarified that proof are mandatory only for the Single Largest Completed Contract. However, the BAC may clarify to the bidder the supporting documents for On-going Contracts, whenever necessary.
 - The Secretariat reminded the bidders on the submission of Mayor’s Permit. An expired submission without attached Official Receipt for the application of renewal is a ground for disqualification.
- The Representatives from Int’l Diamond and OPEMS requested to be clarified whether submission of AFS for FY 2017 or 2018 will be required in connection with the computation of NFCC.
 - The Committee clarified that for the purposes of this project, AFS and NFCC from either 2017 or 2018 are acceptable. If the bidder issued a 2017 AFS the basis for NFCC computation will be for 2017.

Item 6

xxx

Test Result conducted within six months for Filtering Element from international testing centers (Lot No. 1);

xxx

- The Representative from FootSafe requested to be clarified on the covering period of the Test Result. They clarified the acceptable dates of the Test Result for the Filtering Element.
- The End User clarified that it will be within the last six 6 months starting from the Opening of the Bids.

Item 10

xxx

Certification accompanied with a verifiable proof that the brand being offered has been in the Philippine market for at least ten (10) years. (Lot No. 4)

xxx

- The Representative from King's manifested that the 10 years market presence is too long. Thus, they requested for an amendment to 3 years.
- Representative from KIRSSI also manifested that market presence be amended to 3 - 5 years.
- The BAC took note of the requests for discussion. Any amendment will be reflected in the issuance of the Bid Bulletin.
- The Representative from FootSafe requested to be clarified on the acceptable verifiable proof of the brand.
- The Chairperson clarified that a advertisements, brand introduction, news clippings, brochure, or any verifiable proof that corresponds to the presence in the Philippine Market is a requirement.
- The Representative from Unimasters requested to be clarified on the required signatory on the Certification.
- The Committee clarified that bidder may issue the Certification. This will be clarified in the Supplemental Bid Bulletin.
- The Representative from FootSafe asked if an Official Receipt from ten (10) years ago is acceptable to satisfy the market presence in the requirement.
- The Chairperson reiterated that OR can be made whenever desired by a company. Hence, bidders must prove their market presence. The BAC shall also further explain the definition of **MARKET PRESENCE** for clarity among the bidders.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FootSafe also asked if twenty (20) Official Receipts from different companies within ten (10) years is acceptable under Market Presence. The Chairperson agreed so long as contracts and transactions are not limited to a lone company. ➤ The Committee took note of the requests and clarifications for discussion. Any amendment will be reflected in the issuance of Supplemental Bid Bulletin.
<p>GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT</p>	<p>No further clarification.</p>
<p>SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It was emphasized that the Procuring Entity is the Procurement Service. The winning bidder will deliver the item to the Project Site and the Procurement Service will pay the bidder. ➤ The Project Site will be at the OCD Office. No distribution list will be required for the project. ➤ No further clarification from the bidders.
<p>SCHEDULE OF REQUIREMENTS</p>	<p>Page 71 Delivery Period</p> <p style="text-align: center;">xxx Within Sixty (60) Calendar Days from the Date Indicated in the Notice to Proceed xxx</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DVA requested to be clarified on the counting of numbers on the schedule of requirement. ➤ The Secretariat reiterated that the period of counting will start upon the issuance of Notice to Proceed. • International Diamond, OPEMS and Kings requested to amend the delivery period to Ninety (90) Calendar Days. Majority of the bidders seconded on the proposal. This is to give ample time to the bidders in delivering the items. ➤ The BAC took note of the request for discussion. Any amendments will be reflected in the issuance of Supplemental Bid Bulletin. • The Representative from Macrovista requested to be clarified if Bill of Lading is acceptable during the delivery of the item. This is due to some port congestion issue and to ensure that Liquidated Damages will be avoided.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Committee clarified that Bill of Lading is not necessary during the contract implementation, but the supplier may ask in writing regarding the delivery extension of the item. The request will be subject for interpretation and decision of the HOPE.
<p>TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS</p>	<p>Page 74 Lot 2: Rain Suit Quantity: 5,000 pieces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Representative from OPEMS requested for an actual sample of the item for visual purposes and for better understanding with the bidders. ➤ The End User replied in the negative. This will be the first project of Office of the Civil Defense for the said item. • The Representatives from OPEMS and King’s requested to be clarified on the specific color of the Rain Suit the same bidders suggested that color must be dark and visible for disaster operations. • The representative from OPEMS suggested having reflectorized materials on the rain suit for better use during operation. • The Representative from International Diamond requested to be clarified if the item requires zipper, button or Velcro because it’s not clear on the illustration. ➤ The End User took note of the request subject for discussion. Amendments and clarifications will be reflected in the issuance of the Supplemental Bid Bulletin. • The Representative from FootSafe clarified that there is no column for the reference of compliance form. He further stressed that some of the BAC require another column in the compliance. ➤ The Chairperson reiterated that no reference for compliance is needed but the bidders must prove their compliance on the brochures, technical data sheet and other proof for the compliance. <p>Page 75 Lot 3: Safety Helmet Quantity: 510 pieces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Representative from Kings Safetynet requested to be clarified on the head suspension and three-fixing point chin strap of the item. Further, they requested if the helmet is a vented or non-vented, this also may affect the bid offer. ➤ The End Users took note of the request subject for further discussion. The amendments and clarifications will be reflected in the issuance of the Supplemental Bid Bulletin.

	<p>Page 76 Lot 4: All Terrain Footwear Quantity: 510 pairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Representative from OPEMS manifested that not all brands can provide half sizes similar to the required size of 8.5 by the End Users. • The Representative from Footlocker also confirmed the same issue on size. ➤ The BAC took note of the manifestation for clarification and discussion.
III. OTHER MATTERS	
OTHER MATTERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ On the bid form, the Secretariat reminded the bidders that in filling out the form, submission shall be consistent and the same. In case discrepancy in the amounts, whichever is lower shall be used. The amount shall always be favorable and beneficial to the government. ➤ The Chairperson also reminded that any clarification shall be put in writing on or before April 12, 2019 for deliberation and discussion of the Bids and Awards Committee. ➤ The Committee explicitly emphasized the manner of filling out the prescribed forms to avoid failure on the bidders' proposals. ➤ The Committee emphasized that the testing fees will be borne by the bidder being evaluated.
CERTIFICATION	<p>We certify that the foregoing is the true account of the Prebid Conference conducted on April 8, 2019.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>Having no other matters for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.</p>
PREPARED BY	<p style="text-align: center;">PROCUREMENT DIVISION VIII</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>SGD.</u> MS. JAMILLE RAE T. BALUYOT Member</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>SGD.</u> MR. PAUL ARMAND A. ESTRADA Member</p>

<p>CERTIFIED CORRECT</p>	<p>BIDS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE VIII</p> <p><u>SGD.</u> ENGR. JAIME M. NAVARRETE, JR Chairperson</p> <p><u>SGD.</u> MR. JOSEPH P. BALAGTAS Vice-Chairperson</p> <p><u>SGD.</u> ENGR. MARK JOHN O. NOFIES Provisional Member</p> <p><u>SGD.</u> MR. CHRISTOPHER GACUTAN Ad Hoc Representative, OCD</p>
<p>CONFORMED BY</p>	<p><u>SGD.</u> MR. SONNY PATRON TWG, OCD</p> <p><u>SGD.</u> MS. LEILANI A. LEGASPI TWG, OCD</p>