

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

1.	<b>Name of Procurement</b>	Provision of Landscaping and Gardening Services to the University of Namibia (UNAM) for a period three (3) years.
2.	<b>CPBN Procurement Reference No</b>	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2021
3.	<b>Date of Submission of Report</b>	30 June 2021
4.	<b>Contract Number</b>	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2021
5.	<b>Scope of Contract</b>	Provision of Landscaping and Gardening Services to the University of Namibia (UNAM) for a period three (3) years.
6.	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	N\$ 21 875 303,35 (Incl. VAT)
7.	<b>Funding Agency</b>	University of Namibia (UNAM)
8.	<b>Procurement Method Used</b>	Open Advertised Bidding (Non-consultancy Services)
9.	<b>Date of Invitation of Bids</b>	24 September 2021
10.	<b>Closing Date of Submission of Bids</b>	1 November 2021
11.	<b>Date and Place of Opening of Bids</b>	1 November 2021, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	<b>Number of Bids Received by Closing Date</b>	Eighteen (18)

### 13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Conflict of Interest	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
			Stage 1		Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4			
			Eligibility Examination Phase 1	Preliminary/ Administrative Examination Phase 2	Mandatory Documents Examination Stage3	Technical Evaluation Stage5	Financial Requirements Stage6	Financial Evaluation		
5	Greenfields Pesticides Development cc	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not comply with the correct Bid Validity period as requested and specified in ITB 16.1, page 29 of the bidding document. The bidder wrote forty-five (45) days instead of One hundred and eighty (180) days</li> </ul>
1	NAT Solutions cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not provide a Fitness Certificates from Municipality/Town Council or title deed or lease agreement to confirm the location where the bidder operates from, contrary to ITB 5.3 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
8	Kahoha Building Contractor cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not provide a Fitness Certificates from Municipality/Town Council or title deed or lease agreement to confirm the location where the bidder operates from, contrary to ITB 5.3 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>
9	Cuisir Investment cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not provide a Fitness Certificates from Municipality/Town Council or title deed or lease agreement to confirm the location where the bidder operates from, contrary to ITB 5.3 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Conflict of Interest	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
			Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
			Eligibility Examination Phase 1	Preliminary/ Administrative Examination Phase 2	Mandatory Documents Examination Stage3	Technical Evaluation Stages	Financial Requirements Stage6	Financial Evaluation		
13	Economical Gardens Maintenance	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not attach the identification document, instead the bidder submitted the copy of the driver's license, contrary to ITB 5.3, of the bidding document.</li> </ul>	
15	Andre's Landscaping	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not provide a founding statement, instead the bidder submitted a Defensive Name, contrary to ITB 5.3, of the bidding document. Hence, there was no evidence to establish ownership.</li> </ul>		
4	Rocky Construction cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 5% out of 100%.</li> </ul>		
7	Amtshila Investment cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 60% out of 100%.</li> </ul>		
10	Muthakaz Investment cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 40% out of 100%.</li> </ul>		
11	Shannon's Investment cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document.</li> </ul>		

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Conflict of Interest	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
			Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
			Eligibility Examination	Preliminary/ Administrative Examination	Mandatory Documents Examination	Technical Evaluation	Financial Requirements	Financial Evaluation		
			Phase 1	Phase 2	Stage3	Stages	Stage5	Stage6		However, the bidder scored 45% out of 100%.
12	Omdel Trading Enterprises cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 40% out of 100%.</li> </ul>
14	Lizma Trading Enterprises cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder failed to score 70% and more as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 50% out of 100%.</li> </ul>
16	Namibia Landscapes	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified
2	Bertlyne Investment cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified
3	Salon Africana cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified
6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified
17	Ba Sharon Trading Enterprises cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified
18	Roots Nursery & Garden Centre cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified

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

Lot No.	Rank	Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Arithmetic Corrections (N\$)	Bid Price Offered (Including VAT) (N\$)
1	1	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	2,789,918.90	None	2,789,918.90
	2	16	Namibia landscapes	3,268,507.00	None	3,268,507.00
	3	3	Salon Africana cc	4,153,130.34	None	4,153,130.34
2	1	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	569 644,01	846 976,34	1,416,620.35
	2	16	Namibia landscapes	2,754,360.00	None	2,754,360.00
	3	3	Salon Africana cc	2,979,333.86	None	2,979,333.86
3	1	2	Bertyne Investments cc	1,189,275,38	None	1,189,275,38
	2	3	Salon Africana cc	1,513,576.08	None	1,513,576.08
4	<b>No Quote received</b>					
5	1	18	Roots Nursery & Garden Centre CC	1,331,213.88	None	1,331,213.88
6	<b>No Quote received</b>					
7	1	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	1 450 574,40	(394 416,00)	1 056 158,40
	2	16	Namibia landscapes	1,450,250.00	None	1,450,250.00
	3	3	Salon Africana cc	2,777,537.25	None	2,777,537.25
8	1	16	Namibia landscapes	927,270.00	None	927,270.00
	2	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	1 325 697,20	None	1 325 697,20
	3	3	Salon Africana	3,039,470.70	None	3,039,470.70
9	1	2	Bertyne Investments cc	2,397,388.63	None	2,397,388.63
	2	3	Salon Africana cc	4,277,139.93	None	4,277,139.93
10	1	17	Ba Sharon Trading Enterprises cc	2,120,280.00	None	2,120,280.00
11	1	3	Salon Africana	3,665,150.02	None	3,665,150.02 (The price quoted is 40% above the cost estimate for the lot.)

**15. BEST EVALUATED BID(S)  
SELECT FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT:**

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

Lot No.	Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Arithmetic Corrections (N\$)	Bid Price Offered after Arithmetic Corrections (Including VAT) (N\$)	Selected Bidder's Address
1	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	2,789,918.90	None	2,789,918.90	Erf 5429, Windhoek Block, Pasteur Street, Windhoek
2	6	Gift Hamper Trading cc	569 644,01	846 976,34	1,416,620.35	Erf 5429, Windhoek Block, Pasteur Street, Windhoek
3	6	Bertyne Investments cc	1,189,275,38	None	1,189,275,38	18, Nissen-iass street, Pioneerspark
5	18	Roots Nursery & Garden Centre CC	1,331,213.88	None	1,331,213.88	Erf 1501, Sand Street, Henties Bay,
7	16	Namibia landscapes	1,450,250.00	None	1,450,250.00	13, Lilli Encon Street, Eros, Windhoek
8	16	Namibia landscapes	927,270.00	None	927,270.00	13, Lilli Encon Street, Eros, Windhoek
9	2	Bertyne Investments cc	2,397,388.63	None	2,397,388.63	18, Nissen-iass street, Pioneerspark
10	17	Ba Sharon Trading Enterprises cc	2,120,280.00	None	2,120,280.00	D3, EPZ, Katima Mulilo

**For Noting Purposes:**

- ***This Award is subject to the successful bidder(s) providing the three (3) months working capital, as was required in the bidding document, at post-award of this Notice of Selection of Award***
- ***Lots 4, 6 and 12 were not quoted for and lot 11, the prices quoted by the bidder is above the lot's cost estimate.***

11 July 2022

  
A. Ngavetene  
Chairperson



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM**

**PROCUREMENT OF PROVISION OF LANDSCAPING & GARDEN SERVICES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA, FOR A PERIOD OF THREE (3) YEARS**

**(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO: (NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2021))**

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: .....