

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE BID EVALUATION REPORT (SECTION 55(8))

1.	<b>Name of Procurement</b>	Construction of the New Health Centre at Aussenkehr, in the //Karas Region on behalf of the Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS)
2.	<b>CPBN Procurement Reference No</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-08/2021
3.	<b>Date of Submission of Report</b>	02 June 2022
4.	<b>Contract Number</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-08/2021
5.	<b>Scope of Contract</b>	Construction of the New Health Centre at Aussenkehr, in the //Karas Region
6.	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	N\$ 61 100 209.00 (Inc. VAT)
7.	<b>Funding Agency</b>	Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS)
8.	<b>Procurement Method Used</b>	Open Advertised Bidding (Works)
9.	<b>Date of Invitation of Bids</b>	23 July 2021
10.	<b>Closing Date of Submission of Bids</b>	29 September 2021
11.	<b>Date and Place of Opening of Bids</b>	29 September 2021, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	<b>Number of Bids Received by Closing Date</b>	Twenty-six (26)

### 13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
3	JJF Investment CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BEC noted that there was discrepancy with the initials throughout the whole document, the BEC concluded that the bidding document was signed by two different people with two different initials and not by the duly authorized person as required in Evaluation Criteria 1.1, Item No. 3.</li> <li>Amendment No.1, dated 09 September 2021 was not duly acknowledged as stipulated in Evaluation Criteria 1.1, item No. 3.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
5	Iplak Construction CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
6	Ibuild Supplies (Pty) Ltd	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
8	Ashy Trading Enterprises cc	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendment No 2, dated, 09 September 2021 which consisted of eight (8) pages was not duly acknowledged by the bidder as stipulated in Evaluation Criteria 1.1, item No. 3.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
12	Alugodhi Engineering and Construction CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
16	Afrideca Construction Namibia (Pty) Ltd	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not initial the entire company profile booklet consisting of nineteen (19) pages as stipulated in Evaluation Criteria 1.1. item No. 3.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
17	Tatiana trading Enterprises CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
18	August Twenty Six Construction (Pty) Ltd	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
20	NBT Quality Services CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
21	Andjamba Construction CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not initial the entire book of supporting documents (which supporting</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>documents contains mandatory and significant documents such as ID's and educational documents). The bidder only initialed the bidding document and bill of quantities, contrary to Evaluation Criteria 1.1. item No.3.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
22	Luka Roads Rail and Civils CC JV Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of the bid validity issued on 17 March 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
25	Neu Olulya Trading CC JV NGC Investment CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a valid proof of citizenship in a form of an ID for the owner of JV Partner Y-NNEB Trading, contrary to Evaluation Criteria 1.3. item No.1.</li> <li>The bidder submitted company registration or Founding statement documents for both JV partners however, only documents for Ninive General Services CC were certified and JV partner Y-NNEB Trading were not certified, contrary to Evaluation Criteria 1.3. item No.2.</li> </ul>
2	Ninive General Services CC JV Y-NNEB Trading	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only one partner to the JV submitted an original good Standing Tax Certificate. The Tax certificate submitted on behalf of Ninive General</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
								Services CC was not in their name but rather in the name of (CPN Construction CC) which is not a party to this bid, contrary to Evaluation Criteria 1.3. item No.3.
13	CK Heydt Civils CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a letter from SEENA Employment Equity confirming that they are a client of SEENA which the letter is not valid letter in terms of a valid Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate, or proof from Employment Equity Commissioner. The letter does not serve as an exemption in terms of section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998. Therefore, the bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of Evaluation Criteria 1.3. Item No 5.</li> </ul>
1	James and Young Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a list of similar works carried out over the last ten years, with only one project valued at N\$ 10 million (Construction of New Regional Office for the Ministry of ICT in Kavango west) however, the rest of the projects were not amounting to a cumulative financial amount of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4., item No.2.</li> </ul>
11	Ekodi Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a list of similar works carried out over the last ten years however, the projects were not of similar nature (Building Construction). The bidder only submitted one project of similar nature which was the renovation and refurbishment of Mariental High School worth N\$12,553,257.26, completed in 2021. Therefore, the bidder does not meet the</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
								cumulative financial of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4., item No.2.
14	Siku Investment CC JV Amutanga Trading Enterprises	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder provided a list of similar works, which the majority were construction of single even dwellings, not amounting to the required N\$10 million per project requirement and/ or the accumulative financial amount of N\$ 50 million. The only project considered was the construction of new PHC Clinic at Elagu valued at N\$12,204,193.44, completed in Nov 2016. The bidder was deemed non-responsive as he did not do projects to the accumulative financial amount of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4., item No.2.</li> </ul>
19	Omatende Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Score of 70% or more out of 100. The bidder scored 60 points.</li> </ul>
23	New Success Investment CC JV Omidl Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Score of 70% or more out of 100. The bidder scored 30 points.</li> </ul>
26	Palladium Civil Engineering (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Score of 70% or more out of 100. The bidder scored 60 points.</li> </ul>
4	ETN Technical Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>
7	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>
9	Maperes Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1 Preliminary Examination	Stage2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage3 Legal Admissibility	Stage4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage5 Technical Score	Stage6 Financial Requirement	
10	Florida Trading CC JV Penatu Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>
15	Nexus Building Contractors (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>
24	Capital Technical Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not disqualified.</li> </ul>

#### 14. Price Comparison for the Responsive Bid(s)

As provided for in Section 52 (12), of the Public Procurement Act, 15 of 2015 (PPA) the Evaluation Committee has only examined and verified the five (5) lowest priced bids out of six (6) bids that have been deemed substantially responsive to ascertain whether there are any errors in computation and summation.

No	Bidder's Name	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Bid Price After Corrections (N\$)	Price After Margin of Preference (if applicable) N\$	Ranking
7	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	N\$ 70,651,945.79	N\$ 70,651,945.79	None	1
9	Maperes Investment CC	N\$ 70,663,817.53	N\$ 70,663,817.53	None	2
24	Capital Technical Services CC	N\$ 70,918,555.90	N\$ 70,918,555.90	None	3
10	Florida Trading CC JV Penatu Trading CC	N\$ 72,077,784.04	N\$ 72,077,784.05	None	4
4	ETN Technical Services CC	N\$ 74,115,037.68	N\$ 74,115,037.68	None	5
15	Nexus Building Contractors (Pty) Ltd	N\$ 81,949,439.16	Not Verified	None	6

#### 15. Best Evaluated Bid(s)

**Select For Award of Contract:**

**Best Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.**

Given recommendation(s) in the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) report, The Board approved in terms of Section 9 (1) (k) and (l) (i) and Section 55 (6) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Address
7	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	Erf No.6100, Windhoek West



Description	Currency	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC
Bid Price	N\$	Amount (Including VAT)
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	N\$70,651,945.79
Corrections of Errors	N\$	None
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	N\$70,651,945.79

**Bid price, including VAT:** Seventy Million Six Hundred Fifty-One Thousand Nine Hundred Forty-Five and Seventy-Nine Cents (N\$ 70,651,945.79).

20 June 2022

  
**A. Ngavetene**  
 Chairperson



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM**

**CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AT MIX SETTLEMENT, BRAKWATER  
IN THE KHOMAS REGION- PHASE 1 ON BEHALF OF MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, ARTS  
AND CULTURE**

**(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. W/OAB/CPBN-04/2021.)**

I/We \_\_\_\_\_ hereby  
acknowledge receipt of this Executive Summary \_\_\_\_\_ and undertake to  
immediately return the signed acknowledgment of receipt to CPBN as proof of receipt.

Name: ..... Signature: .....

Date: ..... Company Stamp: .....