

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

**Annex-A**

1. Name of Procuring Agency: Federal Public Service Commission (FPSC)
2. Method of Procurement: Open Competitive Bidding
3. Title of Procurement: Procurement for the project titled "Digitalization of In-House Processes & Automation of Examination System of Federal Public Service Commission"
4. Tender Inquiry No: F-26041833765
5. PPRA Ref. No.(TSE): TS0000003926E
6. Pre-Bid Meeting was Convened: 16-04-2026
7. Date & Time of Bid Closing: 27-04-2026 10:00 AM
8. Date & Time of Bid Opening: 27-04-2026 10:30 AM
9. Bid Validity: Till 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2026

10. No. of Bids Received:

S. No.	Appendix-A at Section 38 of Bidding Document	Annexure	No. of Bids Received
A	Desktop System	I	05
B	Laptop	II	06
C	Server	III	02
D	High Speed Scanner	IV	04
E	LaserJet Enterprises Network Printer	V	04
F	Air Conditioner Split Unit (Inverter Technology)	VI	05
G	Biometric Device	VII	04
H	Workstation/Client Access Switches (48 Ports)	VIII	02
I	Workstation/Client Access Switches (24 Ports)	IX	02

11. Criteria for Bid Evaluation:

Single Stage Single Envelope (Least Cost Based)

12. Detail of Bid (s) Evaluation:

Evaluation is carried out on an item-wise basis, selecting the lowest and most advantageous rate per item, provided that the bidder meets the eligibility criteria outlined at Section 2 and fulfills all other conditions specified in the bidding document.

A.	Desktop System			
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Limited	Disqualified	999,900	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document 2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the

				requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence the bid was rejected.
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	891,009	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	Paragon Office Solution	Disqualified	498,500	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. active landline phone bill ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. proof of dealership /partnership / distribution rights of quoted equipment iv. AGPR vendor detail v. Bank account details 2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence the bid was rejected.
4.	Trending Technologies (Private) Limited	Qualified	589,260	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form were incomplete / deficient, failing to meet the requirements of Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence, the bid was rejected.
5.	ATI Technologies	Disqualified	381,500	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates. ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. AGPR vendor detail iv. Bank account details 2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence the bid was rejected.

<b>B. Laptop</b>				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	770,000	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	250,000	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	Paragon Office Solution	Disqualified	385,500	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. active landline phone bill

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi</li> <li>iii. proof of dealership /partnership / distribution rights of quoted equipment</li> <li>iv. AGPR vendor detail</li> <li>v. Bank account details</li> <li>vi. proof of dealership /partnership / distribution rights of quoted equipment</li> <li>vii. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
4.	Trending Technologies (Private) Limited	Qualified	347,600	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Lowest Bidder.</b>
5.	Dream Team	Disqualified	359,850	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Bidder also withdrew the CDR/Bid Security; therefore, bid stands invalid / non-responsive.
6.	ATI Technologies	Disqualified	374,000	<p>Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. three performance certificates.</li> <li>ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi</li> <li>iii. AGPR vendor detail</li> <li>iv. Bank account details</li> </ul> <p>2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence bid was rejected.</p>

C. Server				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	32,450,000	<p>Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. three performance certificates</li> <li>ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi</li> <li>iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document</li> </ul> <p>2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form were incomplete / deficient, failing to meet the requirements of Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence, the bid was rejected.</p>
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	53,185,643	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document; <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>

D. High Speed Scanner				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	696,200	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	254,709	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document; <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	319 Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	342,500	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document; <b>2<sup>nd</sup> lowest bidder.</b>
4.	Dream Team	Disqualified	869,900	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Bidder also withdrew the CDR/Bid Security; therefore, bid stands invalid / non-responsive.


E. LaserJet Enterprises Network Printer				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	460,200	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	390,285	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, therefore, <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	Paragon Office Solution	Disqualified	298,200	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. active landline phone bill ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. proof of dealership /partnership / distribution rights of quoted equipment iv. AGPR vendor detail v. Bank account details vi. proof of dealership /partnership / distribution rights of quoted equipment 2. The specifications quoted in the bid submission form differ from the requirements specified in Appendix-A of Section 38 of the bidding document. Hence the bid was rejected.
4.	Dream Team	Disqualified	384,900	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Bidder also withdrew the CDR/Bid Security; therefore, bid stands invalid / non-responsive.


F. Air Conditioner Split Unit (Inverter Technology)				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	295,000	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	264,000	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	Japan Electronics	Disqualified	217,700	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document.
4.	Friends Corporation	Disqualified	209,000	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. active landline phone bill ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. three performance certificates iv. AGPR vendor detail 2. Bid submission form at Section 39 of the bidding document not provided.
5.	Dream Team	Disqualified	257,900	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Bidder also withdrew the CDR/Bid Security; therefore, bid stands invalid / non-responsive.


G. Biometric Device					
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.		Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	135,700		Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	168,750		Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document, <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>
3.	Digital Data Systems	Disqualified	Unit Cost.	106,200	Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Hence bid was rejected.
			Customized software cost (one time only)	218,000	
4.	Dream Team	Disqualified	160,900		Fail to provide the documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document. Bidder also withdrew the CDR/Bid Security; therefore, bid stands invalid / non-responsive.

H. Workstation/Client Access Switches (48 Ports)				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	1,652,000	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	553,760	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document; <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>

I. Workstation/Client Access Switches (24 Ports)				
S.No.	Name of Firm / Bidder (M/S)	Eligibility Status (Qualified / Disqualified)	Unit Price incl. of all applicable Taxes in Rs.	Rule / Regulation / SBD* / Policy / Basis for Rejection / Acceptance as per Rules 35 of PP Rules, 2004
1.	AS Softlayer Technologies (Private) Ltd.	Disqualified	944,000	Fail to provide the following documents in terms of instructions at Section 2 of the bidding document; i. three performance certificates ii. lease agreement / ownership proof of service centre/office at Islamabad / Rawalpindi iii. signed and stamp copy of bidding document
2.	Ino Tech Solutions (Pvt) Limited	Qualified	363,634	Complied all instructions contained in the bidding document; <b>Lowest &amp; Most Advantageous Bidder.</b>

  
(Muhammad Asghar)  
AD (Log) / Secretary to committee

  
(Adnan Akram)  
Director (logistics) / Member


  
(Muhammad Umar Bhatti)  
Programmer


  
(Muhammad Babar)  
Joint Director (Policy), MoIT


  
(Syed Aqil)  
Deputy Chief (ICT), PD&SI

\* PC-I specifications  
to be strictly observed

  
(Adnan Ahmad Malik)  
Network Administrator

  
Farooq Ahmad/Hassan  
QA Manager (Project) – Coopted Member

  
(Muhammad Ahmad Hassan)  
Deputy Chief (IT) / Member

  
(Syed Muhammad Ayub Shah)  
Director General (Exam) / Chair