

## Department of Budget and Management

## GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT POLICY BOARD TECHNICAL SUPPORT OFFICE

NPM No. 84-2014

24 October 2014

ATTY. ARNALDO M. ESPINAS
BAC Member
LOCAL WATER UTILITIES ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 34, U.P. Post Office, Katipunan Avenue,
Balara, Quezon City.

Re: Exemption from the similar contract requirement under Small A and Small B categories

Dear Mr. Espinas:

This refers to your letter seeking clarifications on whether the exception from the submission of similar contract requirement granted to civil works contractors under Small A and Small B categories also applies to suppliers in the procurement of goods.

As represented, the Honorable Mayor of Sagada raised the issue on whether a bidder for a supply contract, i.e. GI Pipes, is within the coverage of the exception under *Section* 23.5.2.5 of the IRR of RA 9184, which reads:

The contractors under Small A and Small B categories without similar experience on the contract to be bid may be allowed to bid if the cost of such contract is not more than fifty percent (50%) of the Allowable Range of Contract Cost (ARCC) of their registration based on the guidelines as prescribed by the PCAB.

It is in this context that our opinion is being requested.

Section 23.5.2.5 is an exception from the technical eligibility criteria that prospective contractors must have an experience of having completed at least one (1) contract that is similar to the contract to be bid, and whose value, adjusted to current prices using the National Statistics Office consumer price indices, must be at least fifty percent (50%) of the Approved Budget for the Contract (ABC) to be bid.

It is worthy to note that the exception refers to prospective bidders registered with the Philippine Contractors Accreditation Board (PCAB) under Small A and Small B categories participating in a competitive bidding for **infrastructure projects** where the ABC is not more than fifty percent (50%) of the ARCC.

Accordingly, it is clear from the said provision that the exception does not apply in the procurement of goods, but applicable only in the procurement of infrastructure projects. Hence, when the law is clear and free from any doubt or ambiguity, there is no room for construction or interpretation; there is room only for application. As such, pursuant to Section 23.5.2 of the IRR of RA 9184, the eligibility criteria exception applies only in the procurement of infrastructure projects.

We hope that this opinion issued by the GPPB-TSO provided sufficient guidance on the matter. Note that this is issued on the basis of particular facts and situations presented, and may not be applicable given a different set of facts and circumstances. Should there be other concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS SANTIAGO
Executive Director V

//seeR

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Amores v. House of Representatives Electoral Tribunal, G.R. No. 189600, June 29, 2010, citing Ace Holdings Corp. v. Rufina and Company, G.R. No. 160191, June 8, 2006, 490 SCRA 368, 375



COCAL WATER UTILITIES ADMINISTRATION

C ROX SA, U.F. Tour Officer Replacement Avenue, Bedges, Quescen Cris

La, No. 1928-2581 to 99 1928-251 - Busice (843) 722 504 54

Symmotropies Direct Line (801929-61) 37

BMOX Website Worselvice growth

16 September 2014

Acty: Dennis S. Santiago

Executive Director

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT POLICY BOARD

Lant 2506, Raffles Corporate Center,

F. Ortigas Jr. Road, Ortigas Center,

Pasig City 1605

PRIECEIVED

plene prepara OPINION Tor. OSS

Dear Dir. Sentiago

Greetings!

We refer to PCAB-prescribed guideline for confunctors of antissiructine projects, which sintes that thus "Compactors under Small A and Small B categories without sindly experience on the confuct to be but MATRE allowed to but the cost of such confuct to be but MATRE allowed to but the cost of such confuct.

Allowable Kange of Contract Cost (ARCC) of their regulation.

In a recent building of the supply of said CI Paper an issue was miset by the Mayor of Sagada, as to whether a bidder for a supply contract postd by the whole papered by the abtrementioned eligibility requirement, spesifically intracted for new consistors of infrastructure projects without similar experience on the compact to be bid.

The issue was taised because the second biddle was not able to comply with the following eligibility requirements

- Statement of all its on-going great uners and genetic contracts, including contracts
  and genetic for heart of the contracts of the contract of the contract to be but within the relevant period; and
- Statement tilentifying the history stage suggest completed contact similar to the contact to be pld, within the relevant process (gre years).

Kindly clarify the matter for our guidance

Thank you

Very truly yours.

Ante Amalilo M. Espinas BAC Member