

CONFIDENTIAL



Republika ng Pilipinas
Tanggapan ng Pangulo
PAMBANSANG AHENSIYA NA TAGAPAG-UGNAY SA PAMALAYAN
(National Intelligence Coordinating Agency)

Bilang 5 Daang V. Luna, Lungsod Quezon 1100
Tel. 8927-4245 Fax 8927-4331 E-mail: maine@nica.gov.ph

BIDS AND AWARDS COMMITTEE (BAC)
Pre-Bid Conference for the Rental of Twenty-One (21) units
Copying Machine (FY 2022 Early Procurement)
251030H November 2021
Dimalupig Hall, 4th Floor Conference Room, NIC Bldg.,
No. 5 V. Luna Road, Quezon City

BAC REGULAR MEMBERS

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| a) Atty. Roberton G. Lapuz | - Chairperson |
| b) Dir. Alberto M. Azores | - Vice Chairperson |
| c) Dir. Ma Celia G. Ofrasio | - Member |
| d) Dir. Theodore I. Libardo | - Member |
| e) Atty. Rowena M. Acudili | - Member |

Technical Working Group (TWG)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| f) Mr. Antonio C. Mella Jr. | - Chairperson |
| g) Ms. Rona Paula P. Tomas | - Vice Chairperson |
| h) Mr. Glenn A. Bacero | - Member |
| i) Mr. Ferdinand Shane L. Tamayo | - Member |

BAC Secretariat

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| j) Ms. Ruby Anne M. Escandor | - Chairperson |
| k) Atty. Jerome Abraham M. Reyes | - Vice Chairperson |
| l) Mr. Erwin S. Josain | - Member |
| m) Ms. Rhodelia G. Jimenez | - Member |
| n) Mr. Joveneil N. Boniceli | - Member |
| o) Mr. Rodolfo B. Bernabe Jr | - Member |

Prospective Bidders

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| p) Ms. Angelica Ricafrente | - Printcore Office Systems Inc. |
| q) Mr. Framer Serillano | - U-Bix Corporation |
| r) Mr. Marcelo M. Delfin | - Otus Copy System Inc. |

CONFIDENTIAL

This document is for the exclusive use of the requesting office only and may not be shared with others without the written consent of this Agency. Any violation hereof shall be dealt with accordingly.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

1. The Pre-Bid Conference was called to order at 1030H, presided over by BAC Chairperson Atty. **Roberton G. Lapuz**, with the acknowledgement of attendees by the BAC Secretariat.

The BAC Secretariat Chairperson confirmed the presence of a quorum with the attendance of all the five BAC regular members.

After having established the required quorum, BAC Secretariat Chairperson likewise acknowledged the presence of the TWG and BAC Secretariat and support staff. Invitations to observe the pre-bid conference were sent to the COA Resident Auditor on 17 November 2021 and NSCEA President on 19 November 2021. The COA Resident Auditor and NSCEA advised BAC Secretariat on 23 & 25 November 2021, respectively, that they will not be able to attend the pre-bid conference.

Three prospective bidders attended the pre-bid conference and were duly acknowledged. They are as follows: 1) **Printcore** Office Systems Inc.; 2) **U-Bix** Corporation; and 3) **Otus** Copy System Inc.

2. The BAC Chair instructed the TWG to present the technical specifications for this project. The TWG read the technical specifications stated in the Invitation to Bid.
3. Before proceeding with the discussion, the BAC Chair informed the prospective bidders that the arrangement for the presence of all attendees is a mixture of face-to-face and virtual which was opted in accordance with the health protocols being implemented by the Agency to ensure the protection from possible risk of Covid-19 exposure.
4. The BAC Chair invited the three prospective bidders for any clarifications and questions regarding the technical specifications presented by the TWG.
5. Mr. **Framer Serillano** of U-bix Corporation asked whether the print resolution of 1,200 dpi and printing resolution of at least 600 x 600 dpi is a maximum and a minimum requirement, respectively. The BAC Chair requested the TWG for any comment and to amend the specifications to make it more clear for the prospective bidders.
6. Mr. **Marcelo M. Delfin** of Otus Copy System Inc. explained that print resolution pertains to the quality of print-out of the machine while the copying resolution has low quality output resolution same as the scanning resolution which both used the scanning function of the machine. Mr. **Delfin** suggested to retain the print resolution of 1,200 dpi for clearer

C O N F I D E N T I A L

This document is for the exclusive use of the requesting office only and may not be shared with others without the written consent of this Agency. Any violation hereof shall be dealt with accordingly.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

image and also stated that the minimum requirement is 600 x 600 dpi for printing resolution.

7. Mr. **Serillano** requested to change the print resolution to **at least 1,200 x 600 dpi** which is a higher and better specification which was also confirmed by Mr. **Delfin** of Otus. The TWG concurred with the said request and also agreed to delete the printing resolution of at least 600 x 600 dpi.
8. Mr. Serillano further requested that the Connectivity specs include “or its equivalent” after the “Bidirectional Parallel IEEE-1284-B”. The TWG and Mr. **Delfin** agreed to such request. However, Mr. **Delfin** suggested that a much better specification is “**USB Port**”, stating that the Bidirectional Parallel port is obsolete. The TWG concurred with Mr. **Delfin**'s suggestion. The BAC Chair clarified that the USB port has other equivalent and the version of the USB port does not have to be specified, to which the TWG agreed.
9. Mr. **Serillano** also inquired whether the requirement of the Agency for copying machine is brand new or remanufactured.
10. The TWG asked the prospective bidders if there would be a change in price if the Agency will require a brand new copying machine. The Otus representative commented that there will be changes in the cost of brand new units while the U-bix representative said that their company can provide brand new units of copying machine.
11. The TWG commented that if the ABC for this project would not be sufficient if all units to be provided are brand new, a mixture of brand new and remanufactured copying machines may be acceptable.
12. The TWG recommended that the machine should be at least two years old from the time it was manufactured instead of three years as suggested by the Otus representative.
13. Ms. **Angelica Ricafrente** of Printcore Office Systems Inc. proposed that **at least 400,000** copies were printed by the machine instead of the number of years from its manufacturing date.
14. The BAC Chair concurred with the suggestion of Printcore representative and was affirmed by the TWG that 400,000 copies printed is acceptable.
15. The BAC Chair commented that “**Not more than** 400,000...” would be more appropriate than “At least 400,000” requirement for copies made.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

This document is for the exclusive use of the requesting office only and may not be shared with others without the written consent of this Agency. Any violation hereof shall be dealt with accordingly.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

16. Director **Ma Celia Ofrasio** added to include “**and** at least two years from the manufacturing date” and the TWG concurred.
17. The Otus then clarified the Agency’s requirement for copying machines. The BAC Chair replied that as long as the requirement for 400,000 copies printed and all the other features/specs listed were complied, it does not matter if it is brand new or not. The Otus requested for at least three years from the manufacturing date of the copying machine which the TWG finds acceptable. Hence, “**Not more than 400,000 copies printed and at least three years from manufacturing date**” requirement.
18. The U-bix suggested that the Agency require a brand new unit to ensure good condition. However, the BAC Chair replied that the Agency has no technical knowledge to ascertain the good condition of a machine whereas the requirement for 400,000 copies printed and two years from manufacturing date is easily determinable and verifiable that the machine is in good condition.
19. Atty. **Rowena Acudili** suggested that the “**at least** three years from manufacturing date” requirement be changed to “Not more than 400,000 copies printed and **not more than** three years from manufacturing date”, to which the BAC Chair agreed.
20. The BAC Chair moved on to the next aspect of the pre-bid conference which was the discussion on eligibility requirement as well as the financial component aspect of the project.
21. The BAC Secretariat, through Mr. **Erwin Josain**, presented the Checklist for Eligibility and Technical documents requirements and discussed the common reasons for the disqualification of the previous bidders such as letter “f” and “g” requirements on the said checklist.
22. The BAC Chair advised the prospective bidders to be very careful in the submission of bidding documents to avoid disqualification, citing the mistakes committed by the previous bidders such as incompletely filled-out matrix or wrong entries on the matrix submitted.
23. Mr. **Josain** reminded the prospective bidders to comply with all the requirements since a non-discretionary or a simple pass or fail methodology is used in checking the presence or absence of documents required during bid opening.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

This document is for the exclusive use of the requesting office only and may not be shared with others without the written consent of this Agency. Any violation hereof shall be dealt with accordingly.

C O N F I D E N T I A L

24. The BAC Chair further advised the prospective bidders to utilize two different personnel in preparing the bidding documents and checking the correctness and completeness of said documents before sealing the envelopes.
25. Mr. **Josain** also mentioned the issue of conformity to the technical specifications requirements. The BAC Chair reiterated that the bidders should comply and should not insist their own specifications and reminded them to be very careful in the common practice of "copy-paste" thing the technical specifications from the original publication of the Invitation to Bid.
26. Mr. **Serillano** inquired in relation to the letter "k" requirement --"stamp received" by the BIR if an electronic copy is acceptable. Mr. **Josain** responded that they have to show proof that the computerized transaction is authentic.
27. Mr. **Josain** also discussed the packaging and contents of the first and second envelopes to be prepared by the prospective bidders.
28. Director **Ofrasio** reminded the prospective bidders to read the conditions for Early Procurement for this project. The BAC Chair discussed the conditions for Early Procurement Activity which are also specified in the PhilGEPS publication and further advised the prospective bidders to carefully understand the conditions.
29. There being no more questions and clarifications, the BAC Chair thanked the three prospective bidders for their attendance and participation. The BAC Chair informed them that the BAC shall publish a Bid Bulletin not later than seven calendar days before the Bid Opening and shall also post the Minutes of Pre-Bid Conference on the Agency website.
31. The meeting was adjourned at 1215H.

Prepared by:


Ms. **Ruby Anne M. Escandor**
BAC Secretariat Chairperson

Approved by:


Atty. Roberton G. Lapuz
BAC Chairperson

C O N F I D E N T I A L

This document is for the exclusive use of the requesting office only and may not be shared with others without the written consent of this Agency. Any violation hereof shall be dealt with accordingly.