

Table 1. Activities

ACTIVITIES	REMARKS
1. RDF Construction was the only Bidder for the Project The meeting started at 2:00 PM	Submitted his BID Documents on the prescribed time.
2. BID Documents submitted were examined by BAC Members. Eligibility and Technical Documents were subjected to evaluation by the TWG and BAC Members.	1. Documents submitted were not properly arranged as to the guide/list provided 2. Insufficient listing of Construction Equipment 3. Lacks licensed and expert fabricators/welders for the Project 4. Mismatch of Items entered in the S-curve vs. the PERT-CPM submitted for the project. 5. No similar, completed or on-going project presented to the BAC and TWG members.
3. The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 PM	Documents presented were returned to the bidder.

Table 2. Findings:

1. Due to insufficient documents and non-compliance to the minimum documentary requirements, low-capability to construct and implement the offered project in accordance with the specifications, the BAC Members and TWG Members unanimously declared the bidding as "Failure" 2. It was recommended that re-posting of the project details in PHILGEPS be done in compliance to RA 9184 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations for failed bidding.

It is recommended by the TWG that a reposting of the project for bidding in the PHILGEPS be conducted in order to invite other interested and qualified construction firms and join the bid activities as prescribed in the IRR of RA 9184 for failed bidding.

Very truly yours,


ARIEL G. SANTOS, Ed.D
TWG CHAIR


JOHN LEO-VY P. VILLA
TWG MEMBER


WILLIAM P. LUSECO
TWG MEMBER