

Allocation of funds	Date of advertisement of tender	No. of tender document sold	No. of tender submitted	Closing date of tender	Opening date of tender	Details/No. of bidders participated in tender	Name of the eligible and ineligible bidders		Technical Score	Name of the qualified and disqualification bidders		Financial Bid Opening Date	Per Trainee Cost (PKR) (including all direct & indirect taxes)	Ranking	Reasons for disqualification
							Eligible	Ineligible		Qualified	Disqualified				
						International Consulting Associates (Private) Limited	Yes	-	50	-	YES		-		<p>1. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not relevant. Additionally, the documents provided did not demonstrate actual work experience, rather they consisted of validation letters from third parties for services rendered.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 2 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Past Relevant Training Experience" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence (Training Completion Certificates issued to trainees/copies of contracts/ service orders/ completion letters from clients specifying that no. of individuals have been trained by the bidder. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not relevant. The number of trainees trained was not specified in the submitted evidence. Furthermore, the documents provided do not constitute past training evidence, rather they represent third-party validation exercises.</p>
						Interconnect Global (Private) Limited	Yes	-	75	YES	-		7,700	11	-
						Cybervision International	Yes	-	90	YES	-		7,849	12	-
						The Scope Technologies (Private) Limited	Yes	-	75	YES	-		7,656	10	-
						The Capital Technologies (Private) Limited	Yes	-	95	YES	-		7,900	14	-
						Paidar Development Organization (PDO)	Yes	-	75	YES	-		5,846	1	-
						Upstandards	Yes	-	85	YES	-		6,800	5	-
						Wecan (Private) Limited	Yes	-	85	YES	-		6,700	4	-
						The Star Mughal Industries Pvt Limited (Lead)	Yes	-	45	-	YES		-	-	<p>1. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not relevant as per the relevant 5 modules mentioned in the bidding document.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 4 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Trainer Profile" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach documentary evidence (Experience Letter(s) confirming the individual's relevant role as a trainer, a copy of the trainer's degree) of all qualifications and employment history mentioned in the CV, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, your firm did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not sufficient (master's degree with no international certification and a bachelor's degree).</p>
						SA. Bhamba Builders (Lead)	Yes	-	45	-	YES		-	-	<p>1. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence (less than 3) was not sufficient. Only two evidences for client portfolio were provided.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 4 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Trainer Profile" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach documentary evidence (Experience Letter(s) confirming the individual's relevant role as a trainer, a copy of the trainer's degree) of all qualifications and employment history mentioned in the CV, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as no data was provided regarding trainer experience or certifications.</p>
						TSM Design Studio (Private) Limited	Yes	-	75	YES	-		7,000	7	-

Estimated Cost: PKR 184 Million	7-Apr-26	N/A	22	22-Apr-26	22-Apr-26	Mansol Technical Training Services (Private) Limited	Yes	-	30	-	YES	20-May-26	-	-	<p>1. With reference to section 1 of Technical Evaluation criteria "Financial Capacity" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence demonstrating annual sales through audited financial statements or tax returns. Marks would be awarded on the basis of the amount of annual sales, with the minimum amount to be awarded marks being 5 million. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as no evidence was submitted relevant to this section, with no financial statements or tax returns attached.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 2 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Past Relevant Training Experience" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence (Training Completion Certificates issued to trainees/copies of contracts/ service orders/ completion letters from clients specifying that no. of individuals have been trained by the bidder. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not relevant, because it was an internally generated list. The number of trainees trained was less than 300, which was the minimum off to be awarded marks.</p> <p>3. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as the submitted evidence was not provided in the bidder profile form regarding client portfolio.</p>
						MAX Education Services (SMC- Private) Limited	Yes	-	45	-	YES		-	-	<p>1. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as no evidence was provided regarding client portfolio.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 4 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Trainer Profile" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach documentary evidence (Experience Letter(s) confirming the individual's relevant role as a trainer, a copy of the trainer's degree) of all qualifications and employment history mentioned in the CV, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as data provided was not sufficient as per requirements outlined in the bidding document in relevant section. For both trainers, although a PhD degree from a foreign university has been submitted, no international certification has been provided, and the relevant training experience is less than three years.</p>
						KBM Institute of Vocational Training (Private) Limited (Lead)	Yes	-	90	YES	-		7,888	13	-
						Adan Inventions (Private) Limited	Yes	-	90	YES	-		7,308	9	-
						Sigma Enterprises (Lead)	Yes	-	85	YES	-		7,920	15	-
						CHIP Training and Consulting (Private) Limited	Yes	-	100	YES	-		7,000	6	-
						College of Tourism and Hotel Management	Yes	-	45	-	YES		-	-	<p>1. With reference to Section 3 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Client Portfolio" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach evidence of working with local / international clients for training in same / similar modules as mentioned in clause, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as evidence provided regarding client portfolio was not sufficient (less than 3). Evidence for client portfolio was provided, but their relevance could not be mapped to the five acceptable modules mentioned in the bidding document.</p> <p>2. With reference to Section 4 of the Technical Evaluation criteria "Trainer Profile" outlined in the bidding document, bidders were required to attach documentary evidence (Experience Letter(s) confirming the individual's relevant role as a trainer, a copy of the trainer's degree) of all qualifications and employment history mentioned in the CV, and marks would be awarded based on the soundness, innovativeness, enrichment, and relevance of the submitted content. Upon evaluation, the bidder did not achieve the minimum required score in this mandatory section, as data provided was not sufficient as per requirements outlined in the bidding document in relevant section. The trainer attached to the proposal did not have a master's degree.</p>
						FARAN Institute of Technology	Yes	-	70	YES	-		6,322	3	-
						Momekh Enterprises	Yes	-	70	YES	-		6,300	2	-
						EmpowerNet Global (SMC- Private) Limited	Yes	-	95	YES	-		7,200	8	-
Amal Academy	Yes	-	65	YES	-	7,998	16	-							

