

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

1.	<b>Name of Procurement</b>	Nominated SME-subcontractors for the Blading of Gravel Roads in the Windhoek Region on behalf of Roads Authority
2.	<b>CPBN Procurement Reference No</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-02/2022
3.	<b>Date of Submission of Report</b>	17 November 2022
4.	<b>Contract Number</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-02/2022
5.	<b>Scope of Contract</b>	General Conditions of Contract
6.	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	N\$ 147,400,744.82 (Inc. VAT)
7.	<b>Funding Agency</b>	Roads Authority (RA)
8.	<b>Procurement Method Used</b>	Open Advertised Bidding (Works)
9.	<b>Date of Invitation of Bids</b>	28 January 2022
10.	<b>Closing Date of Submission of Bids</b>	28 March 2022
11.	<b>Date and Place of Opening of Bids</b>	28 March 2022, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	<b>Number of Bids Received by Closing Date</b>	Seventy-Four (74)

### 13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
1	Afrikem 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
2	Madida 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
5	Sisenbasen Trading 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 duly fill-in the Letter of Bid, the quoted prices are not appearing in the Letter of Bid. Hence, the bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.5.1.1 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
10	Queen Mwetako 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
12	Larissa 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
18	Okarumatero 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
20	Opuwo Vature Vahimba Investment CC	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
21	Kunene River Construction and Electrical 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
25	Ebdina Trading Enterprise 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 letter of intent to lease Graders from Coastal Hire as required in ITB clause 21.2. of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
32	Omidi Trading 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
36	Namshine Investments 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
39	Tucker Builders & Civil Works 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
45	Flame 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
46	Mundu Mundu Trading 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
49	Van Wyk Engineering 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 duly fill-in the Letter of Bid. The Letter of Bid is incomplete. Hence, the bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.5.1.1 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder submitted an incomplete bid as not all pages of the bidding document were signed or initialled (e.g., page 67 of the Letter of Bid was not initiated; Letter of bid on page 70 to 71 was not completed), as required criteria 1.5.1.3 of the bidding document;</li> <li>The bidder did not initial the following pages 104, 103, and 105 of the bidding document, in terms of criteria 1.5.1.3 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
52	Pioners Investments 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
53	D.P.D Civil and Road Maintenance 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 page 90 of the Bill Of Quantity as required in ITB clause 21.2 and criteria 1.5.1.3 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The Bidder did not duly fill-in the Letter of Bid as required in criteria 1.5.1.1. The quoted prices are not appearing in the Letter</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
55	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	of Bid as required in criteria 1.5.3.2 of the bidding document. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
57	Maperes 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
62	FA Developers 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
66	Jan Andre 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 duly fill-in the Letter of Bid as required in criterion 1.5.1.1. The quoted prices are not appearing in the Letter of Bid as required in criteria 1.5.3.2 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
71	Zenela Investments 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 for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>
73	Carat 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 respond in writing to the request for extension of the bid validity issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
								issued on 16 September 2022 in accordance with ITB 19.2.
22	EMD Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder only submitted Identification Document (ID) for one (1) member only albeit the company is owned by three individuals. Criteria 1.5.3.1 required all the owners/shareholders to submit proof of identification. Hence, the bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.5.3.1 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
64	New Successes Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a Company Registration/Founding Statement in the name of Prudence Investment CC and not in the bidder's name: New Successes Investment CC, as required in criteria 1.5.3.2 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder submitted the written Special Power of Attorney, however, since the BEC could not establish the Company's Ownership because of the wrong Founding Statement submitted, the written Special Power of Attorney could not be considered. The bidder was therefore, deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.5.3.9 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
68	Rex Regies Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit an original nor certified copy of good Standing Certificate as required in criteria 1.5.3.3 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

AN

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
6	Tukaleni Property Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit an original nor certified copy of a Good Standing Certificate from Social Security Commission as required in criteria 1.5.3.4 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit all the Curriculum Vitae (CVs) of employees dedicated to the project. The bidder only has a Site Agent as indicated on page 99 of the bidding document. The rest of the personnel such as Project/Contracts Manager and Grader Operator were not indicated, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.1 of the bidding document in reference to ITB 12.1 (j)(5).</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from a local service provider, nor did it indicate to own/buy or lease a Grader Monitoring System once awarded the bid as required in criteria 1.5.4.5 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
7	Shemuvalula Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products. The bidder only submitted a press release from Ministry of Mines and Energy of a price review announcement together with a list of Fuels prices from different town service stations, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3. in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
9	Goraseb Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit the Curriculum Vitae (CV) for the Diesel Mechanic. The Bidder only submitted CVs for the Project/Contracts Manager, Site Agent and Grader Operator, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.1 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(5) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
11	Polyways InvestmentCC JV M&B Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit the Curriculum Vitae (CVs) for the Site Agent(s). The bidder only submitted CVs for the Project/Contracts Manager, Diesel Mechanic and Grader Operators, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.1 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(5) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder submitted reference letters that do not indicate the amount/contract value of work completed. The references were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project (1): Construction of a new bus shelter of Iyambo Patrick Police College, completed in September 2021</li> <li>Project (2): Routine Road Maintenance in the Khomas Region and completed in June 2016;</li> <li>Project (3): Maintenance Work, at the Ministry of Forestry And Tourism Workshop and the Game Capture in Laifrenz, the reference letter neither indicated the project amount nor the project duration;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
15	Otjomuise Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Project (4): Repair and Plumbing Works at the Directorate of Education Arts and Culture, the reference letter did not indicate the project amount nor the project duration, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.2 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from suppliers for the Supply of Tyres. The bidder only submitted letters of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products from Engine Namibia, and Grader related equipment &amp; parts from Barloworld and ITR Namibia, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 of the bidding document.</li> <li>• The bidder did not submit the Curriculum Vitae (CV) for the Diesel Mechanic. The bidder only submitted CVs for the Project/Contracts Manager, Site Agent and Grader Operators, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.1 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(5) of the bidding document.</li> <li>• The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products. The bidder only submitted letters of intent for the Supply of Tyre(s) from Pupkewitz and Grader related equipment &amp; parts from ITR Namibia, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
23	Bollman Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder's projects value for Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out over the last ten (10) years does not accumulate to N\$ 5,100,000.00 as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2) of the bidding document. The bidder only submitted a written declaration stating that the bidder was just a farmer and has no experience in Construction and Road Maintenance works.</li> </ul>
26	Topaz Construction and Engineering CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BEC could not verify whether the bidder's projects value for Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out over the last ten (10) years accumulates to N\$ 5,100,000.00, since the bidder did not provide verifiable reference letters as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder only submitted reference letters as a sub-contractor from main contractors without supporting letters that were issued by the Principal Agent, Engineer or employer, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2) of the bidding document. Thus, these reference letter could not be considered.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products. The bidder only submitted letters of intent for the adequate and efficient Supply of Tyre(s) and</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
								<p>Grader related equipment &amp; parts from ITR Namibia, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a letter stating that it owns a new grader, however, the NATIS Disc Renewal paper submitted, indicated that the grader's first licensing was in December 2015 which was seven (7) years ago. The criteria required a new grader at the start of the project. The bidder did also not submit any letter of intent to buy/lease a new grader, as required in criteria 1.5.4.4 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(3) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
27	Ozombara Construction and Renovation CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder owns two (2) graders, however, there is no indication whether the graders are old or new. The NaTis registration does also not indicate the first year of registration. The bidder also made no provision that they will either buy or lease a new grader as required in criteria 1.5.4.4 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not indicate provision to buy or hire a caravan for any of the Lots it bid for as required in criteria 1.5.4.4 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(3) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
29	Florida Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products. The only letter submitted was for the Supply of</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
30	Ndahomenwa Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Grader related equipment &amp; parts and also for the Supply of Tyres contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 of the bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder's projects values for Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out over the last ten (10) years does not accumulate to the financial amount of N\$ 5,100,000.00 as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2) of the bidding document. The bidder submitted one project of Graveling of various road and construction of a platform for the Usakos Town Council to the value of N\$1.5 million.</li> <li>The bidder submitted a form on their own letterhead titled as specific experience stating other projects completed (construction of houses, maintenance of bitumen road) however, there were no reference letters nor certificates of completion submitted to validate the work done as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
44	Nilotse Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products. The bidder only submitted two letters of intent for the Supply of Tyres and Grader related equipment &amp; parts from Barloworld Namibia, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
47	CAG Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit any proof of reference letters nor Completion Certificates on projects completed as required in criteria 1.5.4. 2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j) (2) of the bidding document. The bidder only completed Form F8 (general experience) on page 14 of the bidding document indicating projects completed.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from a local service provider, nor did it indicate to own/buy a Grader Monitoring System once awarded the bid as required in criteria 1.5.4.5 in reference to ITB 12.1(i) (5) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
50	THHR Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a list nor reference letter of any work carried out over the last ten (10) years as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder only submitted letters of intent for the Supply of Tyre(s) and Grader related equipment &amp; parts from Barloworld Namibia. However, the bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products as required in criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
59	Amakalu Contruction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products but rather a list of fuel prices from different towns. The bidder only had letters of intent for Tyre(s) and Grader related equipment &amp;</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
60	Cascades Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>parts from Tiger Wheels and Barloworld Equipment contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a list of Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out by the bidder over the last ten (10) years with no values in monetary terms. Hence, could not be verified whether these projects accumulate to financial amount of N\$ 5,100,000.00, as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j) (2) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products and for Grader related equipment &amp; parts, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document. The bidder only submitted a letter of intent from suppliers for the Supply of Tyre(s) from Tiger wheels and Tyres.</li> <li>The bidder submitted a letter of intent to lease two Graders from Coastal Hire. However, there was no provision to hire or buy a caravan as required in criteria 1.5.4.4 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(3) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder's projects value for Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out over the last ten (10) years does not accumulate to N\$ 5,100,000.00, as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j) in reference to ITB 12.1(j)</li> </ul>
61	Yamutiti U Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>parts from Tiger Wheels and Barloworld Equipment contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a list of Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out by the bidder over the last ten (10) years with no values in monetary terms. Hence, could not be verified whether these projects accumulate to financial amount of N\$ 5,100,000.00, as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j) (2) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products and for Grader related equipment &amp; parts, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document. The bidder only submitted a letter of intent from suppliers for the Supply of Tyre(s) from Tiger wheels and Tyres.</li> <li>The bidder submitted a letter of intent to lease two Graders from Coastal Hire. However, there was no provision to hire or buy a caravan as required in criteria 1.5.4.4 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(3) of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder's projects value for Construction and Road Maintenance works carried out over the last ten (10) years does not accumulate to N\$ 5,100,000.00, as required in criteria 1.5.4.2 in reference to ITB 12.1(j) in reference to ITB 12.1(j)</li> </ul>

A.N.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
65	Dunedin Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>(2) of the bidding document. The bidder's projects are only valued at N\$3.8 million.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products, as required in criteria 1.5.4.3 in reference to ITB 12.1(j)(2)(iii) of the bidding document. The bidder only submitted a letter of intent from suppliers for the Supply of Tyre(s) from Namibia Tyres and for Grader related equipment &amp; Spares parts from Barloworld Equipment.</li> </ul>
70	Vero Group JV ProVentures Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit the Curriculum Vitae (CV) for the Diesel Mechanic. The Bidder only submitted CVs for the Project/Contracts Manager, Site Agent and Grader Operators, contrary to criteria 1.5.4.1 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder only submitted a letter of intent for the Supply of Fuel &amp; Fuel products however, not for the Supply of Tyre(s) and Grader related equipment &amp; parts as required in criteria 1.5.4.3 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a letter of intent from a local service provider, nor did it indicate to own/buy a Grader Monitoring System once awarded the bid as required in criteria 1.5.4.5 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
3	Erago Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder submitted financial statements with no Current Assets, as such the bidder's Average Current ratio could not be calculated or determined in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
14	CapitalGrow Number Three	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder only submitted full financial statements for the year 2021 and 2018. For the year 2020, the bidder submitted an incomplete Management Account and financial statements. There was also no statements submitted for the financial year 2019 as required in criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
19	Jakomina J. Burger Blading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder's Average Current ratio calculated was 0.7, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
40	Ndinependa Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder's Debt Service Cover Ratio (DSCR) calculated was 0.73, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
43	Alugodhi Engineering and Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder's Average Current ratio calculated was 0.7, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> <li>The bidder's Debt Service Cover Ratio (DSCR) calculated was 0.68, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
56	Lau Tom Construction, Supply and Civil Cervicess CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder's Average Current ratio calculated was 0.5, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
58	Paulus Mwashipange Plant Hire (PMPH) Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder's Debt Service Cover Ratio (DSCR) calculated was 0.9, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>



Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
	JV Penatu Trading CC							
63	Magnate Civil Engineering CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder's Average Current ratio calculated was 0.5, contrary to the required ratio of <math>\geq 1</math> in terms of criteria 2.2.2 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
8	Golden West Investment West CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Technical Score of 70% or more out of 103 points. The bidder scored 67.5 points.</li> </ul>
24	Vulture Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Technical Score of 70% or more out of 103 points. The bidder scored 45.5 points.</li> </ul>
41	Dynamite Contactort Pty Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Technical Score of 70% or more out of 103 points. The bidder scored 67.5 points.</li> </ul>
51	Epandule Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not obtain the minimum Evaluation Technical Score of 70% or more out of 103 points. The bidder scored 67.5 points.</li> </ul>
4	Potenza Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
13	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
16	Venmart Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
17	NDES Civil Works Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
	And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV							
28	Dinaledi Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
31	Sumseno Contracting CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
33	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
34	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
35	Colosseum Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
37	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
38	Pisces Investment Holdings Number Eight CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
42	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
48	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
54	Highway Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
67	Illimite Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
69	Sash Trading & Earthworks	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage1	Stage2	Stage3	Stage4	Stage5	Stage6	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Financial Requirement	Technical Score	
72	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.
74	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.

#### 14. PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BID(S)

As provided for in Section 52 (12), of the Public Procurement Act, 15 of 2015 (PPA) and the bidding document ITB 32.1, the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) examined and verified twenty-five (25) lowest priced bids that have been deemed substantially responsive to ascertain whether there are any errors in computation and summation.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate	
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 39	14 538 875,00	-	14 538 875,00	No				1		
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 360 642,00	-	15 360 642,00	yes				2	Recommended	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		15 957 400,00	-	15 957 400,00	yes				3	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		16 072 299,19		16 072 299,19	yes				4	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate	
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		16 268 831,50	-	16 268 831,50	yes				5		
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		16 602 425,23	-	16 602 425,23	yes				6		
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		16 835 494,00	-	16 835 494,00	yes				7		
13.	J. O Optome Trading Enterprises CC		16 889 751,00	-	16 889 751,00	yes				8		
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		16 964 455,00	-	16 964 455,00	yes		17 271 224,70	14 680 541,00	19 861 908,41	9	
48.	Shivell Trading Enterprises CC		16 972 597,00	-	16 972 597,00	yes				10		
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		17 336 227,00	-	17 336 227,00	yes				11		
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		17 806 496,80	-	17 806 496,80	yes				12		
67.	Ilimite Investment CC		18 083 951,25	-	18 083 951,25	yes				13		
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 180 798,50	-	18 180 798,50	yes				14		
4.	Potenza Investment CC		18 602 898,01	-	1 44	18 602 896,57	yes			15		
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 135 080,00	-	-	19 135 080,00	yes			16		
16.	Vernmart Investment CC		21 009 242,29	-	3 978,59	21 005 263,71	No			17		
35.	Cobsseum Investment CC		27 261 900,00	-	276 000,00	26 985 900,00	No			18		

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 43	14 622 307,50	-	14 622 307,50	No	17 481 553,95	14 859 320,86	20 103 787,04	1	
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 458 679,00	113 275,50	15 571 954,50	yes				2	
72.	Kal Engineering and Fabrication CC		16 129 900,00	-	16 129 900,00	yes				3	Recommended
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		16 259 805,25		16 259 805,25	yes				4	1st Alternate
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		16 465 481,50	-	16 465 481,50	yes				5	2nd Alternate
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		16 847 106,70	-	16 847 106,70	yes				6	
13.	J. O Optome Trading Enterprises CC		17 008 776,00	-	17 008 776,00	yes				7	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		17 041 631,50	-	17 041 631,50	yes				8	
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		17 092 542,00	-	17 092 542,00	yes				9	
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		17 119 705,00	-	17 119 705,00	yes				10	
4.	Potenza Investment CC		16 649 736,98	569 250,00	17 218 986,98	yes				11	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		17 533 337,00	-	17 533 337,00	yes				12	
42.	Oncjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		17 550 674,12	-	17 550 674,12	yes				13	
67.	Ilimite Investment CC		18 309 926,25	-	18 309 926,25	yes				14	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 414 536,00	-	18 414 536,00	yes				15	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 304 705,00	-	19 304 705,00	yes				16	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		21 264 432,36	331,72	21 264 764,08	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		27 376 900,00	-	27 376 900,00	No				18	

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 42	14 570 758,75	-	14 570 758,75	No	17 584 852,70	14 947 124,80	20 222 580,61	1	
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 728 067,00	-	15 728 067,00	yes				2	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		16 267 900,00	- 138 000,00	16 129 900,00	yes				3	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		16 303 133,72	-	16 303 133,72	yes				4	Recommended
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		16 562 081,50	-	16 562 081,50	yes				5	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC		16 884 001,00	-	16 884 001,00	yes				6	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		16 911 129,50	-	16 911 129,50	yes				7	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		16 948 253,23	-	16 948 253,23	yes				8	
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		17 136 955,00	-	17 136 955,00	yes				9	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		17 142 946,50	-	17 142 946,50	yes				10	
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		17 609 350,00	-	17 609 350,00	yes				11	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		17 740 107,00	-	17 740 107,00	yes				12	
67.	Ililimite Investment CC		18 444 476,25	-	18 444 476,25	yes				13	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 572 373,50	-	18 572 373,50	yes				14	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 393 830,00	-	19 393 830,00	yes				15	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		21 351 824,65	305,50	21 352 130,16	No				16	
4.	Potenza Investment CC		21 964 645,69	- 701,14	21 963 944,55	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		26 566 150,00	-	26 566 150,00	No				18	

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
16.	Venmat Investment CC	GU-WHK 20	2 322 989,29	7,03	2 322 996,32	No				1	
31.	Sunsero Contracting CC		14 234 504,50	-	14 234 504,50	yes				2	Recommended
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		14 859 587,00	-	14 859 587,00	yes				3	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
67.	Ilimate Investment CC		14 898 681,25	-	14 898 681,25	yes				4	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		14 985 860,45	-	14 985 860,45	yes				5	
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC		15 105 508,75	-	15 105 508,75	yes				6	
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 212 499,00	-	15 212 499,00	yes				7	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		15 477 119,91	-	15 477 119,91	yes				8	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		15 497 141,83	-	15 497 141,83	yes				9	
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		15 528 580,23	-	15 528 580,23	yes				10	
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		17 407 205,00	-1 778 475,00	15 628 730,00	yes	11				
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		15 884 467,00	-	15 884 467,00	yes	12				
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		16 394 400,00	-	16 394 400,00	yes	13				
13.	J. O Opitoma Trading Enterprises CC		17 634 376,00	-	17 634 376,00	yes	14				
4.	Potenza Investment CC		17 857 324,66	13,81	17 857 338,47	No	15				
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 861 598,50	-	18 861 598,50	No	16				
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 314 825,00	-	19 314 825,00	No	17				
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		26 928 400,00	1 167 250,00	28 095 650,00	No	18				

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 19	14 708 488,50	-	14 708 488,50	yes	15 035 215,16	12 779 932,89	17 290 497,43	1	Recommended
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		15 337 642,00	-	15 337 642,00	yes				2	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		17 198 480,00	-1 779 165,00	15 419 315,00	yes				3	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
37.	Filemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 475 067,00	-	15 475 067,00	yes				4	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		15 509 682,00	-	15 509 682,00	yes				5	
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		15 671 653,09	-	15 671 653,09	yes				6	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		16 048 497,03	-	16 048 497,03	yes				7	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		16 170 150,00	-	16 170 150,00	yes				8	
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		16 391 030,50	-	16 391 030,50	yes				9	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		16 756 806,98	-	16 756 806,98	yes				10	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		16 947 126,80	-	16 947 126,80	yes				11	
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC		17 129 641,00	-	17 129 641,00	yes				12	
67.	Ilimate Investment CC		18 256 048,75	-	18 256 048,75	No				13	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 331 678,50	-	18 331 678,50	No				14	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		18 718 489,61	210,81	18 718 700,42	No				15	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 313 675,00	-	19 313 675,00	No				16	
4.	Poterza Investment CC		21 915 801,18	142,27	21 915 943,45	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		26 577 650,00	1 518 000,00	28 095 650,00	No				18	



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
31.	Sum seno Contracting CC	GU-WHK 31	14 085 464,50	-	14 085 464,50	yes	15 357 309,19	13 053 712,81	17 660 905,57	1	Recommended
67.	Illimite Investment CC		14 660 976,25	-	14 660 976,25	yes				2	1st Alternate
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		14 773 337,00	-	14 773 337,00	yes				3	2nd Alternate
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		14 828 712,95	-	14 828 712,95	yes				4	
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC		14 925 361,25	5 060,00	14 930 421,25	yes				5	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		15 017 936,83	-	15 017 936,83	yes				6	
37.	Fillmon Investments And Trucks CC		15 057 249,00	-	15 057 249,00	yes				7	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		15 320 864,86	-	15 320 864,86	yes				8	
42.	Ondjirakomunungu Cleaning Services		15 509 706,07	-	15 509 706,07	yes				9	
48.	Shivell Trading Enterprises CC		15 700 467,00	-	15 700 467,00	yes				10	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		16 221 900,00	-	16 221 900,00	yes				11	
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		15 465 430,00	1 757 775,00	17 223 205,00	yes				12	
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC		17 456 126,00	-	17 455 482,00	yes				13	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 671 844,50	4,00	18 671 848,50	No				14	
4.	Potenza Investment CC		18 876 063,78	-	18 876 036,18	No				15	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		19 093 750,74	213,08	19 093 963,82	No				16	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 164 175,00	-	19 164 175,00	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		27 888 650,00	-	27 382 650,00	No				18	

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 34	12 731 736,25	-	12 731 736,25	yes				1	
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		13 299 439,50	-	13 299 439,50	yes				2	
67.	Illimite Investment CC		13 953 093,75	-	13 953 093,75	yes				3	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		14 000 539,36	0,06	14 000 539,30	yes				4	Recommended
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		14 154 211,50	-	14 154 211,50	yes				5	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
13.	J. O Optome Trading Enterprises CC		14 376 426,00	-	14 376 426,00	yes				6	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		14 380 348,77		14 380 348,77	yes				7	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		14 502 612,00	-	14 502 512,00	yes				8	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		14 893 650,00	-	14 893 650,00	yes				9	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		15 105 198,25	64 018,20	15 169 216,45	yes				10	14 472 974,54
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		14 090 605,00	1 097 100,00	15 187 705,00	yes	11				
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		15 820 653,45	-	15 820 653,45	yes	12				
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		16 040 867,00	-	16 040 867,00	yes	13				
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		17 244 825,00	-	17 244 825,00	No	14				
16.	Venmart Investment CC		17 913 913,60	141,02	17 914 054,62	No	15				
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		17 993 061,00	-	17 993 061,00	No	16				
4.	Potenza Investment CC		18 077 287,93	-	18 077 287,93	No	17				
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		28 434 900,00	-	28 434 900,00	No	18				

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK37	12 772 130,00	-	12 772 130,00	No	16 737 171,82	14 226 596,05	19 247 747,59	1	
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC		14 376 426,00	-	14 376 426,00	yes				2	Recommended
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		14 893 650,00	-	14 893 650,00	yes				3	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		14 090 605,00	1 097 100,00	15 187 705,00	yes				4	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
37.	Filemon Investments And Trucks CC		15 458 679,50	-	15 458 679,50	yes				5	
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		15 584 392,54	-	15 584 392,54	yes				6	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		15 612 262,00	92,00	15 612 354,00	yes				7	
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		15 779 299,50	-	15 779 299,50	yes				8	
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		15 938 517,00	-	15 938 517,00	yes				9	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		16 039 796,35	-	16 039 796,35	yes				10	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		16 313 557,30	-	16 313 557,30	yes				11	
67.	Illimite Investment CC		17 575 363,75	-	17 575 363,75	yes				12	
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		17 802 790,92	-	17 802 790,92	yes				13	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		17 915 109,60	141,02	17 915 250,62	yes				14	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		17 993 061,00	-	17 993 061,00	yes				15	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		18 039 245,00	-	18 039 245,00	yes				16	
4.	Potanza Investment CC		21 480 750,57	63 250,00	21 417 500,57	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		28 434 900,00	-	28 434 900,00	No				18	

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Code	Bid price(s) read out at Bid Opening (N\$)	Difference	Arithmetically Corrected Bid Price (N\$)	15% Up/Down Threshold	Budget (N\$)	15% Down	15% up	Rank	Recommended/Alternate
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 10	14 856 160,00	-	14 856 160,00	No				1	
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC		15 719 350,00	-	15 719 350,00	yes				2	
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC		15 760 267,00	-	15 760 267,00	yes				3	Recommended
37.	Fillemon Investments And Trucks CC		16 004 929,50	-	16 004 929,50	yes				4	1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC		16 303 435,00	-	16 303 435,00	yes				5	2 <sup>nd</sup> Alternate
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC		16 664 007,54	-	16 664 007,54	yes				6	
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV		16 947 637,86	-	16 947 637,86	yes				7	
69.	Sash Trading & Earthworks		17 186 462,00	- 1 000,00	17 185 462,00	yes				8	
55.	Efindana Maintenance and Construction Services		17 188 703,85	-	17 188 703,85	yes	17 963 569,31	15 269 033,91	20 658 104,71	9	
74.	Luka Roads and Rails and Civils CC		17 292 205,00	-	17 292 205,00	yes				10	
42.	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning Services		17 738 149,42	-	17 738 149,42	yes				11	
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC		18 265 450,00	-	18 265 450,00	yes				12	
67.	Illimite Investment CC		18 724 788,75	-	18 724 788,75	yes				13	
33.	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC		18 868 211,00	-	18 868 211,00	yes				14	
16.	Venmart Investment CC		19 258 170,69	245,89	19 258 416,58	yes				15	
28.	Dinaledi Investment CC		19 706 745,00	-	19 706 745,00	yes				16	
4.	Potenza Investment CC		23 233 145,54	- 828,00	23 232 317,54	No				17	
35.	Colosseum Investment CC		28 158 900,00	-	28 158 900,00	No				18	



**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 (No.15 of 2015) (PPA), as amended.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Allocated	Bid price(s) read out Bid Opening	Corrections of errors	Discounts	Proposed Award Amount (including VAT)	Physical Address
37.	Fillemon Investments and Trucks CC	GU-WHK 39	N\$15,360,642.00	None	None	N\$15,360,642.00	Erf 5477 Ongwediva
72.	Kai Engineering and Fabrication CC	GU-WHK 43	N\$16,129,900.00	None	None	N\$16,129,900.00	Erf 21 August Gots Street, Windhoek North
38.	Pisces Investment Holdings No. Eight CC	GU-WHK 42	N\$16,303,133.72	None	None	N\$16,303,133.72	Erf 35 Afille Streetp Shimi, Ludwigsdorf
31.	Sumseno Contracting CC	GU-WHK 20	N\$14,234,504.50	None	None	N\$14,234,504.50	10434 Friedrich Maharero Street, Windhoek
34.	Omuve Construction Technologies CC	GU-WHK 19	N\$14,708,488.50	None	None	N\$14,708,488.50	PO Box 1106 Oshakati
67.	Illimite Investment CC	GU-WHK 31	N\$14,660,976.25	None	None	N\$14,660,976.25	PO Box 20772 Windhoek
17.	NDES Civil Works Construction CC And NDES Trading Enterprises CC JV	GU-WHK 34	N\$14,000,539.36	N\$(0.06)	None	N\$14,000,539.30	Erf 3164, Unit 2, Maangaan Streer, Okahandja

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Allocated	Bid price(s) read out Bid Opening	Corrections of errors	Discounts	Proposed Award Amount (including VAT)	Physical Address
13.	J. O Opitome Trading Enterprises CC	GU-WHK 37	N\$ 14,376,426.00	None	None	N\$ 14,376,426.00	4 Lindequist Street Windhoek
			<b>Bid price, including VAT: Fourteen Million, Three Hundred Seventy-Six Thousand, Four Hundred and Twenty-Six Namibia Dollars</b>				
48.	Shiveli Trading Enterprises CC	GU-WHK 10	N\$15,760,267.00	None	None	N\$15,760,267.00	Erf.2674 Anton Loboski Street, Ongwediva
			<b>Bid price, including VAT: Fifteen Million, Seven Hundred Sixty Thousand, Two Hundred Sixty-Seven Namibia Dollars</b>				

29 November 2022

  
  
 A. Ngavetene  
 Chairperson

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM</b>	
<b>NOMINATED SME-SUBCONTRACTORS FOR THE BLADING OF GRAVEL ROADS IN THE WINDHOEK REGION ON BEHALF OF ROADS AUTHORITY (PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. W/OAB/CPBN-02/2022)</b>	
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: .....