

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

1.	<b>Name of Procurement</b>	Procurement of Nominated SME Sub-Contracts for the Blading of Gravel Roads in the Oshakati Region								
2.	<b>Procurement Reference No</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-07/2022								
3.	<b>Date of Submission of Report</b>	16 March 2023								
4.	<b>Contract Number</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-07/2022								
5.	<b>Scope of Contract</b>	Procurement Of Nominated SME Sub-Contracts for The Blading of Gravel Roads In the Oshakati Region								
6.	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	<table> <tr> <td>GU-OSH 04</td> <td>N\$ 18,727,971.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GU-OSH 05</td> <td>N\$19,209,416.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GU-OSH 20</td> <td>N\$ 20,431,879.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GU-OSH 25</td> <td>N\$ 20,823,167.02</td> </tr> </table>	GU-OSH 04	N\$ 18,727,971.83	GU-OSH 05	N\$19,209,416.19	GU-OSH 20	N\$ 20,431,879.19	GU-OSH 25	N\$ 20,823,167.02
GU-OSH 04	N\$ 18,727,971.83									
GU-OSH 05	N\$19,209,416.19									
GU-OSH 20	N\$ 20,431,879.19									
GU-OSH 25	N\$ 20,823,167.02									
7.	<b>Funding Agency</b>	Roads Authority								
8.	<b>Procurement Method</b>	Open Advertised Bidding								
9.	<b>Date of Invitation of Bids</b>	29 July 2022								
10.	<b>Deadline of Submission of Bids</b>	12 October 2022								
11.	<b>Date and Place of Opening of Bids</b>	12 October 2022 Central Procurement Board of Namibia ERF 8161, Julius Nyerere Street, Windhoek.								
12.	<b>Number of Bids Received</b>	97								

**13. RESPONSIVENESS OF BID(S):**

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
2	Carat Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial some of the supporting documents, i.e., Copy of the Identification Document (ID) of the owner, Founding Statement, Good Standing Certificates, Affirmative Action Certificate; <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
5	Mudjanima Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the some of the supporting documents, i.e., organizational structure document, letter of bid, company profile, ID copy of the Diesel Mechanic, as well as the letter of good standing from Bank Windhoek, <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
8	RCAG Construction CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial some of the supporting documents, i.e., company profile, founding statement, Tax Registration Certificate for VAT and Income Tax, Good Standing Social Security Certificate, Affirmative Action certificate, etc., <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
9	Ebdina Trading Enterprises CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial two pages of the Equipment Management Solutions documents from Barloworld, <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
12	JV. Kunene Emerging Contractors	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not sign the letter of bid. Pages 69-71 (last pages of the letter of Bid) where bidder is supposed to complete, and sign are not attached in the bidding document. Bidder was therefore found to be non-compliant to the requirements as set out in <b>criteria 1.5.1(1-3) on page 46 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
21	Bima Dunes Trading CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not sign the Bid Securing Declaration as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(6) on page 46 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
24	D-Square Trading Enterprises CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the Identification Document (ID) copy of the owner in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
29	Maperes Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete the bid submission sheet form/letter of bid (Bidder's witness did not sign the form on page 70) as required in <b>criteria 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids, Item 1.5.1.1 on page 46 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
33	Milnor Engineering CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the consent letters for use of CVs for the Site Agent and Grader Operator as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
36	Sib Investment CC JV 2M Civil Contractor CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the Certificate of Completion of works for contract No. F1/18/2-1/2007 in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
40	Tucker Builders and Civil Works CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial some of the supporting documents, i.e., consent letter for use of CV for the Diesel Mechanic, Reference letter from Techno Nam, Financial ability letter from Bank Windhoek, Deal confirmation letter from Bank Windhoek, as well as the Fitness Certificate as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
45	New Success Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the entire Company Profile document in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
47	AJ Engineering and Construction CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial page 2 of the Letter of Quotation from Barloworld Equipment in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
53	Menell Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some pages of the bid were signed by a person who is not duly authorized by the power of attorney to sign the bid, i.e., Annual financial statement of 2020, staff CV Consent and Authorization. Furthermore, Bidder did not initial the table of content in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
59	Ipilak Construction CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the copy of the Affirmative Action Certificate in the book of supporting document as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
60	Ozombara Construction and Renovation CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial pages 118-127 and page 151 of the bidding document as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
62	Opuwo Vatuwe Vahimba Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete the bid submission sheet form/letter of bid (Bidder's witness did not sign the form on page 70) as required in <b>criteria 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids, item 1.5.1.1 on page 46 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
63	ETN Technical Services CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial some pages of the letter of bid (i.e., pages inserted between page 67 and 68) in the original bidding document, as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
68	J.O Epitome Trading CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the Deal Confirmation Letter from Nedbank in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
75	Lau Tom Construction Supply and Civil Services CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial page 31 (Written Undertaking for Labor) in the book of supporting documents as required in <b>Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									<i>Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</i>
78	Moza Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial some of the supporting documents i.e., Confirmation letter of financing credit ceiling from FNB; first page of Part B2 Financial Capacity Ceiling declaration, Consent letter for use of CV for the Graduate Trainee; <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document</b></li> </ul>
79	Centurion Investments (Pty) Ltd	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial page 212 of the bidding document as well as page 11 of the 2018 Financial Statements in the book of supporting documents <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
84	Omalenga Construction CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the Certificate of Service from Basil Read Mining for the Diesel Mechanic in the book of supporting documents <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
86	Proxeus Trading CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial pages 118-127 of the bidding document <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
88	Golden West Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete the responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iii-iv of the bidding document <b>as per the instruction on page iii, and stage 1.5.1 Preliminary Examination of</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	
								<i>Bids, item 1.5.1.3 on page 46 of the bidding document</i>
90	Eliah and Son Trading CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial all supporting documents except the Financial Statements <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
92	Kanguloshi Kane Hova Investments CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not initial some of the supporting documents, i.e., Social Security Good Standing Certificate and Employment Equity Certificate; Confirmation letter of credit from Standard Bank;, Letter of Intent for a performance guarantee from Standard Bank; Confirmation of banking details from Standard Bank; both letters of intent to lease plant required for Bid from EquipMe;. Both letters of support from Barloworld; page 2 of the Bid Securing Declaration, <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
93	Waponyo Trading CC	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not initial the consent letter for use of CV for the Site agent, as well as page 11 of the Training Manuals from Road's Authority in the book of supporting documents <b>as required in Criteria 1.5.1(3) on page 46, read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
4	Zenela Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder has the same witness that signed the letter of bid in common with Bidder No.2.</li> <li>Therefore, Bidder was deemed to have a relationship with other bidder(s), in terms of ITB</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
89	Goresab Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p><b>5.3 (d) and Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest, Item No. 1.5.3.3 on page 47 of the bidding document.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder was deemed to have a relationship with Bidder No.88, directly or through common third parties in terms of <b>ITB 5.3 (d) and Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest, Item No. 1.5.3.3 on page 47 of the bidding document.</b></li> <li>The Bidder's company profile has the same content with Bidder No 88's company profile and only the business name and registration numbers are different. i.e., Page 3, page 6 (Mission statements &amp; Values), Page 8 and 9- service pledge, business model, Affirmative Action, corporate social responsibility and equal employment, etc.</li> <li>The figures in Bidder No.89 cashflow forecast (Expenditure figures) excluding salaries &amp; wages for the year 01 Oct 2018 to 30 Sept 2019, and for the year 01 Oct 2019 to 30 Sept 2020 which are the same, are appearing on Bidder No.88 cashflow forecast (Expenditure figures) for the years 01 Aug 2022-30 July 2023, 01 Aug 2023-30 Jul 2024, 01 Aug 2024-30 Jul 2025.</li> <li>The bidder's quoted prices in the letter of Bid are the same to the cent as that of Bidder No.88.</li> <li><i>Bidder No.89 made a mistake on page 100 of the bidding document by writing Bidder No.88's name (Golden West Investments CC) and scratching it out to write their name (Goresab Trading CC);</i></li> </ul>



#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive	
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores		Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation
7	Potenza Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted an invalid/expired Good Standing Tax Certificate. The period on the submitted certificate is 06/06/2022-04/10/2022. <b>Bidder was therefore found to be non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.5.4.2 ITB 12.1(j)(a) on page 48 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
10	J Three Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted the undertaking (Form Part F13), however, Bidder did not stamp page 113 as required by bullet number 3 on the Notice to Bidders on page II of the bidding document that states, "<b>Take note to stamp all pages where it is indicated that a stamp is required in addition to the signatures</b>".</li> </ul>
25	Hoanib Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete part F3 FORM on page 100, <b>as required in Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, Item No. 1.5.4.8 on page 49 of the bidding document.</b> The bidder completed parts of the form but did not make any selection with regards to whether or not a contract non-performance occurred or to whether or not the bidder has pending litigation.</li> </ul>
27	Ekondjitho Engineering Group CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not complete <i>Part F13-Undertaking Local Suppliers</i> on page 113 of the bidding document. The bidder instead wrote their own undertaking titled "<i>Re: Written undertaking as contemplated in Section 138(2) of the Labour Act, 2007</i>" the written undertaking form" in the book of supporting documents.</li> <li>The Bidders undertaking does not state that the bidder will abide to sub-clause 52.1 of the General Conditions of Contract if awarded the contract or part thereof <b>as required in criteria</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, Item 1.5.4.8 on page 49 on the bidding document.
32	Saigon Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted an unsigned written Special Power of Attorney therefore, failing to fully comply with <b>ITB 21.1, criteria 1.5.4.8 Legal Admissibility Grid read together with the Responsiveness Criteria Checklist on page iv of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>
37	Jacob's Auto Truck Tractor and Earthmoving Repairs CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete part F3 FORM on page 100, <b>as required in Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, item No. 1.5.4.6 on page 49 of the bidding document.</b> The bidder did not complete any part of the form and did not make any selection with regards to whether a contract non-performance occurred or not. Further, the bidder struck through the page, and marked it "N/A".</li> </ul>
46	Magnetize Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete part F3 FORM on page 100, <b>as required in Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, item No. 1.5.4.6 on page 49 of the bidding document.</b> The bidder did not complete any part of the form and did not make any selection with regards to whether a contract non-performance occurred or not. Further, the bidder struck through the page, and marked it "N/A".</li> </ul>
54	Volt Investment CC JV Bonga Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted an uncertified copy of ID of the owner of Bonga Trading CC, <b>contrary to the requirements in Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, item No. 1.5.4.6 on page 49 of the bidding document.</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
55	Vidu Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted an Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate belonging to a different entity (GTK Trading CC), and not in the name of the Bidder.</li> <li>The bidder was therefore deemed to be non-compliant for stage 1, criteria 1.5.4(5) Legal Admissibility Evaluation Grid.</li> </ul>
64	Halutusane Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted an uncertified copy of ID of the owner, contrary to the requirement of 1.5.4.1, Legal Admissibility Evaluation Grid.</li> <li>Bidder further submitted an uncertified copy of the Company Registration documents, contrary to the requirement of 1.5.4.2, Legal Admissibility Evaluation Grid</li> </ul>
74	Eponga Trading Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted a Written Special Power of Attorney that is not signed by both members of the CC.</li> <li>The bidder was therefore, deemed to be non-compliant for stage 1, criteria 1.5.4.9 Legal Admissibility Evaluation Grid.</li> </ul>
85	Pisces Investment Holdings Number Eight CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not duly complete part F3 FORM on page 100, as required in Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation, Item No. 1.5.4.8 on page 49 of the bidding document. The bidder completed parts of the form but did not make any selection with regards to whether or not a contract non-performance occurred or to whether or not the bidder has pending litigation.</li> </ul>
11	Dynamite Contractor Investments (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									<p>of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference letter of works completion from Bicon/Aurecon Joint Venture that does not indicate the contract duration.</li> <li>A reference from Oshakati Town Council that does not indicate the contract duration.</li> <li>A Certificate of Completion from Lithon Project Consultants that does not indicate contract amount</li> <li>One (1) reference letter/completion certificate from Tulipamwe Consulting Engineers with a contract amount of N\$ 3 886 472.15.</li> <li>The evidentiary proof submitted by the bidder which was considered for evaluation in terms of ITB 12.1(j)(2) does not accumulate to N\$ 6 million</li> </ul>
14	Twali Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</li> <li>Certificates of Practical Completions from Agostinho Ferreira Architect, Pieter Moster Argitek, Lithon Project Consultants, and Ministry of Works and Transport, that do not indicate</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	
15	Magnate Civil Engineering CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Contract amount, Contract duration and Scope of works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certificate of Practical Completion HVG QS for a contract amount of N\$ 4 142 462.15, which is less than the cumulative value of N\$ 6 000 000.00.</li> <li>• <b>The evidentiary proof submitted by the bidder which was considered for evaluation in terms of ITB 12.1(j)(2) does not accumulate to N\$ 6 million</b></li> <li>• Bidder did not submit the consent letter for use of CV and CV of Project/Contracts Manager as required in ITB 12.1 (j)(5) on page 34 and criteria 1.5.5(1) and (2) on page 50 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
16	Brumar Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</li> <li>• Four (4) completion certificates (one from Lithon Project Consultants and three from Claud Bosch Agapitus Architects Inc) which do not indicate Contract amount, contract duration and scope of works</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
17	Larissa Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter of recommendation from Vivo Energy Namibia that does not indicate the contract amount, contract duration, and scope of works.</li> <li>• Two (2) acceptance letters and eleven (11) appointment letters from Road Authority. These letters were however not considered for evaluation because they are not in the required form (i.e., Final/completion certificates, reference letters) as specified in ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>• Two (2) letters of reference from Road Authority that do not indicate the contract amount, contract price and scope of works.</li> <li>• <b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> <li>• Bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the adequate and efficient Supply of tyre(s), as required in ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) on page 34, and criteria 1.5.5(4) on page 50 of the bidding document</li> <li>• Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two (2) reference letters, one from Baobob Trading Enterprises and another from Ozombare Construction &amp; Renovations CC. These letters</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
30	Capital Grow Number Three CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
31	Rex Regis Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>are from other contractors, contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Notice for Award and three (3) appointment letters from Road Authority. These letters were however not considered for evaluation because they are not in the required form (i.e., Final/completion certificates, reference letters) as specified in ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>Two (2) letters of Authorization for cleaning services and sewerage removal from Ministry of Health. These letters were not considered for evaluation because they are not relevant to construction and road maintenance works.</li> <li><b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two (2) reference letters from TechnoNam Bridges &amp; Roads (Pty) Ltd that do not indicate contract amounts and duration.</li> <li>One reference letter from ProcuSpec that does not indicate contract duration</li> <li>Two (2) Reference Letters (one from JEFK Building Constructions CC and one from Zerc Six Five Trading CC), however, these letters are</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	
								from other Contractors, contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> </ul>
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference letters from Road Authority and Genored that do not indicate the contract amount.</li> <li>Reference letters from Ministry of Veteran Affairs (Supply and delivery of fencing materials), Ministry of Agriculture (Supply and delivery of sanitation infrastructures materials) and Otjondjupa Regional council (Supply and delivery of school chairs, desks and cleaning materials). These letters were not considered for evaluation because they are not relevant to construction and road maintenance works.</li> </ul> </li> <li>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> </ul>
34	Qatar Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered



#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
35	Royal Contractors CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two (2) Certificates of Practical Completion (one from the Municipality of Gobabis and one from Municipality of Swakopmund), with support letters (Award letters), however, they do not indicate the duration of the contracts</li> <li>Three (3) Completion Certificates (one from Namwater and two from Nampower), that do not indicate the contract amounts</li> <li>Four (4) Reference Letters (two from Geckoh Fifty-Eight Investment, and two from Vlocity Trading Enterprises CC). These letters are from other contractors, contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2)</li> <li>A Certificate of Practical Completion from Knight Piesold Consulting with a contract amount of N\$ 2 520 393.72.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The evidentiary proof submitted by the bidder which was considered for evaluation in terms of ITB 12.1(j)(2) does not accumulate to N\$ 6 million</li> </ul>
42	Mawila Technical Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not make provision to acquire the Caravans/submit proof as required in 1.5.5.5, Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, item (3.6 Equipment).</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
43	Somseb Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the adequate and efficient supply of Fuel products, as required in ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) on page 34, and criteria 1.5.5(4) on page 50 of the bidding document</li> </ul>
48	Hlamutifi U Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the adequate and efficient supply of Fuel products, as required in ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) on page 34, and criteria 1.5.5(4) on page 50 of the bidding document</li> </ul>
50	Lela Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only two reference letters from other contractors (Afri Host Trading Group and NCCS Investment Holding (Pty) Ltd), contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
51	Amakalu Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									<p><b>1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document.</b> Specifically, the bidder submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One reference letter from Nexus Civils (Pty) Ltd (another contractor), contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>• The rest of the Bidder's evidentiary proof are payment certificates. These certificates were however not considered for evaluation because they are not in the required form (i.e., Final/completion certificates, reference letters) as specified in ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>• <b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> <li>• The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the adequate and efficient supply of Fuel products, <b>as required in ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) on page 34, and criteria 1.5.5(4) on page 50 of the bidding document</b></li> <li>• The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the adequate and efficient supply of Fuel products, <b>as required in ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) on page 34, and criteria 1.5.5(4) on page 50 of the bidding document</b></li> <li>• Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the <b>submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page</b></li> </ul>
52	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	
58	Alugodhi Engineering and Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	
72	D.P.D Civil and Road Maintenance CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									<p><b>50 of the bidding document.</b> Specifically, the bidder submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Completion Certificate from WCE that does not indicate duration of the contract</li> <li>• A reference letter from SALINI that does not indicate the duration of the contract</li> <li>• An appointment letter from JjKharas Regional Council, this letter was however not considered for evaluation because it was not in the required form (i.e., Final/completion certificates, reference letters) as specified in ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li>• A Completion Certificate form Otjozondjupa Regional Council that indicates all the required information however, it is for a contract amount of N\$ 374 842.66.</li> <li>• <b>The evidentiary proof submitted by the bidder which was considered for evaluation in terms of ITB 12.1(j)(2) does not accumulate to N\$ 6 million</b></li> </ul>
73	Cascades Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</li> <li>• A total of thirteen (13) Completion Certificates that all do not indicate contract amounts.</li> <li>• <b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive	
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores		Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation
76	Omid Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two (2) reference letters from Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd, another Contractor, contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2)</li> <li>A Certificate of Practical Completion from Ministry of Works and Transport that does not indicate the duration of Contract</li> <li>Practical Completion Certificate from Shivute &amp; Associates Quantity Surveyors that does not indicate the duration of Contract</li> <li>A Final Completion certificate from Focus Engineering Services CC that does not indicate the scope of works and contract duration</li> <li>A final completion certificate from Hotel Destiny that does not indicate the contract duration.</li> <li><b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements</li> </ul>
95	Khorab Bricks and Beton CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive	
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores		Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation
97	Tandii Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two (2) reference letters from Road Authority that do not indicate contract amounts</li> <li>A certificate of practical completion from Worley Parsons that does not indicate contract amount and contract duration</li> <li>A certificate of practical completion from Dunamis Consulting Engineers that does not indicate contract amount and contract duration</li> <li>A reference letter from Jacobs Engineering Consulting CC that does not indicate Contract amount and contract duration</li> <li>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> </ul> <p>Bidder submitted evidentiary proof of experience of at least two (2) projects completed by the bidder over the last ten (10) years in Construction and Road Maintenance works, however, the submitted evidentiary proof does not fully comply with the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2) on page 33, and criteria 1.5.5(3) Technical Evaluation Criteria on page 50 of the bidding document. Specifically, the bidder submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference letter from Ministry of Health and Social Services (with completion certificates) that do not indicate the contract duration</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	
1	Pelico Engineering Group CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference letter from NCCS Investment Holdings (Pty) Ltd, from another contractor contrary to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</li> <li><b>None of the bidder's submitted evidentiary proof fully comply to the requirements of ITB 12.1(j)(2).</b></li> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li><b>Bidder scored 35.5 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
6	Mwandi Construction and Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li><b>Bidder scored 55 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
18	Khankan Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li><b>Bidder scored 67.5 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
23	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
38	Shambekela Construction Plumbing and Electrical CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder scored 60 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</li> <li>• Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• Bidder scored 49.5 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</li> </ul>
41	PP Immigration Business Consultants CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• Bidder scored 61 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</li> </ul>
66	Hibachi Investment Holdings (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• Bidder scored 33 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</li> </ul>
69	Shisho's Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• Bidder scored 61.5 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</li> </ul>



#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
71	Dinaledi Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>Bidder scored <b>61.5 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
81	Fusion Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>Bidder scored <b>65 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
83	Oshikoto Building Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>Bidder scored <b>65 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
91	Niilotse Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not obtain the minimum required Technical Evaluation Score of 70 points, as specified in Criteria 2.1 on page 51 of the bidding document.</li> <li>Bidder scored <b>65 points out of 100, a score less than the minimum required of 70 points.</b></li> </ul>
28	Ndes Trading Enterprises CC JV	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder submitted proof of working capital that does not meet all the requirements of <b>ITB 12.1 (j) 4 (i) on page 34, and criteria</b></li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
	Ndes Civil Works & Construction								<p><b>2.2.1 Financial Requirements on page 53 of the bidding document. Bidder specifically submitted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A letter of intent from Development Bank of Namibia (DBN) that does not indicate the minimum amount of N\$ 907 413.31 (Per GU Lot bid for)</li> <li>• A letter from Bank Windhoek for performance guarantee and not working capital as required.</li> <li>• Bidder submitted proof of working capital that does not meet all the requirements of <b>ITB 12.1 (j) 4 (i) on page 34, and criteria 2.2.1 Financial Requirements on page 53 of the bidding document. Bidder specifically submitted:</b></li> <li>• A letter of intent from Development Bank of Namibia (DBN) that does not indicate the minimum amount of N\$ 907 413.31 (Per GU Lot bid for)</li> </ul>
61	Queen Mwetako Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder did not submit financial statements for the last recent three (3) years as required in <b>ITB 12.1(j)(4)(ii) on page 43 and criteria 2.2.1 Financial requirements on page 53 of the bidding document.</b> Bidder, specifically, submitted:</li> <li>• Financial statements for the year ending May 2018, May 2019, and May 2020. Since the bidder's financial year ends in May of each year, the bidder ought to have</li> </ul>
94	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bidder did not submit financial statements for the last recent three (3) years as required in <b>ITB 12.1(j)(4)(ii) on page 43 and criteria 2.2.1 Financial requirements on page 53 of the bidding document.</b> Bidder, specifically, submitted:</li> <li>• Financial statements for the year ending May 2018, May 2019, and May 2020. Since the bidder's financial year ends in May of each year, the bidder ought to have</li> </ul>

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
									submitted financial statements for FY May 2019, FY May 2020, and FY May 2021
96	Nessipark Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder has an Average Current Ratio of 0.98, which is less than 1, contrary to the requirements of criteria 2.2.2, Financial Requirements on page 53 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
3	Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
13	N'Olune – Tangeni JV	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
19	Venmart Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
20	Wecca Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
22	Vinlah Management Solutions CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
26	LP Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
39	James and Young Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
44	Sash Trading and Earth Works CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
49	Truth Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
56	Namibia Solutions Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
57	Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
65	Highway Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
67	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
70	Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
77	Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness Per Evaluation Stage							Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1.5.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Stage 1.5.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.3: Conflict of Interest	Stage 1.5.4: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Stage 1.5.5: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 2.1: Technical Scores	Stage 2.2: Financial Requirements and Financial Evaluation	
80	Kumene River Construction and Electrical CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
82	Geckoh Fifty Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
87	CHW Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

#### 14. BENCHMARK PRICE RANGE

Bidders whose Bid Prices are more than 15% above or below the respective Benchmark Prices calculated for any given lot were deemed non-Responsive and were rejected as far as that specific lot is concerned. Tables 15 summarise the results of the Benchmark Price Range Check

Lot Code	Benchmark Price (BP)	Lower Limit (BP -15%)	Upper Limit (BP +15%)
GU-OSH 04	N\$ 18,727,971.83	N\$ 15,918,776.06	N\$ 21,537,167.60
GU-OSH 05	N\$19,209,416.19	N\$ 16,328,003.70	N\$ 22,090,828.62
GU-OSH 20	N\$ 20,431,879.19	N\$ 17,367,097.31	N\$ 23,496,661.07
GU-OSH 25	N\$ 20,823,167.02	N\$ 17,699,691.97	N\$ 23,946,642.07

15. PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BID(S):

15.1 PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BIDS FOR LOT GU-OSH 04:

REFERENCE KEY:

LOT CODE	BENCHMARK PRICE (BP)	LOWER LIMIT (BP -15%)	UPPER LIMIT (BP +15%)
GU-OSH 04	N\$ 18,727,971.83	N\$ 15,918,776.06	N\$ 21,537,167.60

Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (VAT Incl) N\$	Bid Price after arithmetic correction	Price after Margin of Preference (If Applicable N\$)	Bid Price Within 15% above and below the Benchmark?	Ranking	Recommendation
Geckoh Fifty-Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd	15,467,744.95	None	None	X	N/A	<b>Non-Responsive</b>
Sash Trading and Earth Works CC	15,918,783.00	None	None	✓	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not recommended for award in terms of ITB 1.1(C) on page 32 of the Bidding Document, which states: "A Nominated SME Sub-Contractor shall only be considered for only one (1) lot per Region; and a total maximum of two (2) contract areas across the four (4) Roads Authority maintenance regions i.e., Keetmanshoop, Windhoek, Otjiwarongo and Oshakati"</li> <li><b>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-KHP 03-Keetmanshoop Region.</b></li> </ul>
Highway Trading CC	15,918,806.00	None	None	✓	2	<b>Selected for Award</b>
Wecca Investments CC	15,921,980.00	None	None	✓	3	
Truth Investment CC	16,001,571.50	None	None	✓	4	
N'Olune – Tangeni JV	16,010,815.20	None	None	✓	5	
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	16,295,281.50	None	None	✓	6	
CHW Trading Enterprises CC	16,531,940.00	None	None	✓	7	
Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	16,557,125.00	None	None	✓	8	
Venmart Investments CC	16,571,202.61	None	None	✓	9	
Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	16,685,025.01	None	None	✓	10	
Vinlah Management Solutions CC	16,689,306.00	None	None	✓	11	
Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises CC	16,894,814.46	None	None	✓	12	
Namibia Solutions Services CC	17,014,020.00	None	None	✓	13	
Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	17,155,762.10	None	None	✓	14	
Kunene River Construction and Electrical CC	17,571,364.05	None	None	✓	15	
James and Young Enterprises CC	18,138,329.00	None	None	✓	16	
LP Investments CC	18,192,080.00	None	None	✓	17	

## 15.2 PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BIDS FOR LOT GU-OSH 05:

### REFERENCE KEY:

LOT CODE	BENCHMARK PRICE (BP)	LOWER LIMIT (BP -15%)	UPPER LIMIT (BP +15%)
GU-OSH 05	N\$19,209,416.19	N\$ 16,328,003.70	N\$ 22,090,828.62

Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (VAT Incl) N\$	Bid Price after arithmetic correction	Price after Margin of Preference (If Applicable N\$)	Bid Price Within 15% above and below the Benchmark?	Ranking	Recommendation
Geckoh Fifty-Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd	15,865,377.00	None	None	X	N/A	Non-Responsive
Wecca Investments CC	15,927,385.00	None	None	X	N/A	Non-Responsive
Truth Investment CC	16,156,120.00	None	None	X	N/A	Non-Responsive
Sash Trading and Earth Works CC	16,328,022.00	None	None	✓	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not recommended for award in terms of ITB 1.1(C) on page 32 of the Bidding Document, which states: "A Nominated SME Sub-Contractor shall only be considered for only one (1) lot per Region; and a total maximum of two (2) contract areas across the four (4) Roads Authority maintenance regions i.e., Keetmanshoop, Windhoek, Otjiwarongo and Oshakati"</li> <li><b>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-KHP 03-Keetmanshoop Region.</b></li> </ul>
Highway Trading CC	16,328,045.00	None	None	✓	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-OSH-04- Oshakati Region</li> </ul>
N'Olune – Tangeni JV	16,422,621.00	None	None	✓	3	<b>Selected for Award</b>
Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	16,519,175.00	None	None	✓	4	
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	16,734,121.50	None	None	✓	5	
Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	16,905,077.51	None	None	✓	6	
Venmart Investments CC	17,178,034.61	None	None	✓	7	
Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises CC	17,277,258.46	None	None	✓	8	
CHW Trading Enterprises CC	16,825,765.00	17,380,640.00	None	✓	9	
Vinlah Management Solutions CC	17,413,806.00	None	None	✓	10	
Namibia Solutions Services CC	17,453,895.00	None	None	✓	11	
Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	17,549,062.10	None	None	✓	12	
Kunene River Construction and Electrical CC	18,010,552.50	None	None	✓	13	
James and Young Enterprises CC	18,541,979.00	None	None	✓	14	
LP Investments CC	18,647,940.00	None	None	✓	15	

### 15.3 PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BIDS FOR LOT GU-OSH 20:

REFERENCE KEY:

LOT CODE	BENCHMARK PRICE (BP)	LOWER LIMIT (BP -15%)	UPPER LIMIT (BP +15%)
GU-OSH 20	N\$ 20,431,879.19	N\$ 17,367,097.31	N\$ 23,496,661.07

Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (VAT Incl) N\$	Bid Price after arithmetic correction	Price after Margin of Preference (If Applicable N\$)	Bid Price Within 15% above and below the Benchmark?	Ranking	Recommendation
Geckoh Fifty-Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd	16,875,029.85	None	None	X	N/A	Non-Responsive
Namibia Solutions Services CC	17,257,255.35	None	None	X	N/A	Non-Responsive
Sash Trading and Earth Works CC	17,367,110.25	None	None	✓	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not recommended for award in terms of ITB 1.1(C) on page 32 of the Bidding Document, which states: "A Nominated SME Sub-Contractor shall only be considered for only one (1) lot per Region; and a total maximum of two (2) contract areas across the four (4) Roads Authority maintenance regions i.e., Keetmanshoop, Windhoek, Otjiwarongo and Oshakati"</li> <li><b>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-KHP 03-Keetmanshoop Region.</b></li> </ul>
Highway Trading CC	17,367,139.00	None	None	✓	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-OSH-04- Oshakati Region</li> </ul>
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	17,381,566.44	None	None	✓	3	<b>Selected for Award</b>
Wecca Investments CC	17,411,460.00	None	None	✓	4	
N'Olune – Tangeni JV	17,471,133.50	None	None	✓	5	
Truth Investment CC	17,506,151.00	None	None	✓	6	
Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	17,612,323.60	None	None	✓	7	
CHW Trading Enterprises CC	17,641,977.50	None	None	✓	8	
Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	17,652,398.23	None	None	✓	9	
Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	17,717,429.00	None	None	✓	10	
Kunene River Construction and Electrical CC	17,930,984.00	None	None	✓	11	
Venmart Investments CC	18,217,097.68	None	None	✓	12	
Viniah Management Solutions CC	18,238,586.00	None	None	✓	13	
LP Investments CC	18,254,870.00	None	None	✓	14	
James and Young Enterprises CC	18,734,742.00	None	None	✓	15	
Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises CC	18,803,468.31	None	None	✓	16	



### 15.4 PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BIDS FOR LOT GU-OSH 25:

REFERENCE KEY:

LOT CODE	BENCHMARK PRICE (BP)	LOWER LIMIT (BP -15%)	UPPER LIMIT (BP +15%)
GU-OSH 25	N\$ 20,823,167.02	N\$ 17,699,691.97	N\$ 23,946,642.07

Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (VAT Incl) N\$	Bid Price after arithmetic correction	Price after Margin of Preference (If Applicable N\$)	Bid Price Within 15% above and below the Benchmark?	Ranking	Recommendation
Geckoh Fifty Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd	17,198,305.20	None	None	X	N/A	<b>Non-Responsive</b>
Sash Trading and Earth Works CC	17,699,709.80	None	None	X	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not recommended for award in terms of ITB 1.1(C) on page 32 of the Bidding Document, which states: "A Nominated SME Sub-Contractor shall only be considered for only one (1) lot per Region; and a total maximum of two (2) contract areas across the four (4) Roads Authority maintenance regions i.e., Keetmanshoop, Windhoek, Otjiwarongo and Oshakati"</li> <li><b>Bidder has been Selected for Award for Lot GU-KHP 03-Keetmanshoop Region.</b></li> </ul>
Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	17,699,719.00	None	None	✓	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder not recommended for award in terms of ITB 1.1(C) on page 32 of the Bidding Document, which states: "A Nominated SME Sub-Contractor shall only be considered for only one (1) lot per Region; and a total maximum of two (2) contract areas across the four (4) Roads Authority maintenance regions i.e., Keetmanshoop, Windhoek, Otjiwarongo and Oshakati"</li> <li><b>Bidder has been Awarded Lot GU-WHK 43, Windhoek Region.</b></li> </ul>
Highway Trading CC	17,699,880.00	None	None	✓	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder has been selected for award for Lot GU-OSH-04- Oshakati Region</li> </ul>
Wecca Investments CC	17,704,135.00	None	None	✓	4	<b>Selected for Award</b>
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	17,711,058.00	None	None	✓	5	
N'Olune – Tangeni JV	17,808,831.00	None	None	✓	6	
Truth Investment CC	17,838,004.20	None	None	✓	7	
Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	17,990,390.01	None	None	✓	8	
Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	18,166,842.10	None	None	✓	9	
CHW Trading Enterprises CC	18,223,130.00	None	None	✓	10	
Kunene River Construction and Electrical CC	18,276,375.00	None	None	✓	11	
James and Young Enterprises CC	18,304,044.00	None	None	✓	12	

Namibia Solutions Services CC	18,497,127.85	None	None	✓	13	
Venmart Investments CC	18,549,692.05	None	None	✓	14	
LP Investments CC	18,698,080.00	None	None	✓	15	
Vinlah Management Solutions CC	18,872,503.98	18,880,056.00	None	✓	16	
Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises CC	19,155,521.95	None	None	✓	17	

## 16. 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 it in terms of Section 9 (1) (k) and (l) (i) and Section 55 (6) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 as follows:

Bidder Name	Lot Allocated	Price at Bid Opening (VAT Incl) N\$	Bid Price after arithmetic correction	Discounts	Proposed Award	Physical Address
Highway Trading CC	GU-OSH 04	15,918,806.00	None	None	15,918,806.00	No. 9 Beethoven Street, Windhoek West
N'Olune – Tangeni JV	GU-OSH 05	16,422,621.00	None	None	16,422,621.00	Erf 228 Samuel Kakwele Outapi
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	GU-OSH 20	17,381,566.44	None	None	17,381,566.44	Erf 1837 Ekuku
Wecca Investments CC	GU-OSH 25	17,704,135.00	None	None	17,704,135.00	No. 3 GIPF Complex Oshakati

*\*Please note that the allocation of Lots was done in consideration of bidders awarded contract areas in other regions such as Keetmanshoop, Otjiwarongo and Windhoek, as stated on page 41, item (v) of the bidding document.*

28 April 2023

  
A. Ngavetene  
Chairperson



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM**

**PROCUREMENT OF NOMINATED SME SUB-CONTRACTS FOR THE BLADING OF  
GRAVEL ROADS IN THE OSHAKATI REGION  
PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO: W/OAB/CPBN-07/2022**

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

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

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