

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

1.	Name of Procurement	Construction of New Primary School at Swakopmund in the Erongo Region – Phase 1, on behalf of Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture.
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	W/ONB/CPBN-08/2020
3.	Date of Submission of Report	29 July 2021
4.	Contract Number	W/ONB/CPBN-08/2020
5.	Scope of Contract	Construction of New Primary School at Swakopmund in the Erongo Region – Phase 1
6.	Estimated Cost:	N\$65,000,000.00 (Excl. VAT)
7.	Funding Agency	Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture.
8.	Procurement Method Used	Open National Bidding
9.	Date of Invitation of Bids	09 October 2020
10.	Closing Date of Submission of Bids	23 February 2021
11.	Date and Place of Opening of Bids	23 February 2021, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	Number of Bids Received by Closing Date	Twenty-Two (22)



13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
9	TJ Civil Technology CC JV Mascon Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not submit an identification document for one of the close corporation members as required in Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder submitted a JV agreement. However, it does not indicate the percentage of both partners, no indication that there will be a JV bank account, no roles and responsibilities outlined as per Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.
13	Walcon Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the identification documents for the two (2) members submitted were not certified as required in Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
14	ETN Technical Services CC JV STS Mega Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The good Standing Social Security Certificate submitted is not valid as it was issued on the 16th of September 2020, before the invitation to bid was advertised on the 09th of October 2020. The Contract/Tender No. reads "2020/09/30 instead of "W/ONB/CPBN-08/2020" contrary to Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder did not fill in the Form CON – 2 on page 65 for declaration of no historical contract non-performance as required in Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 8 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder submitted a joint venture agreement but did not indicate that there will be a JV bank account. However, the Bidder submitted a Bank confirmation letter for ETN Technical Services CC only contrary to Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
18	Afrideca Construction Namibian Pty Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as four (4) of the identification documents submitted for the listed trust beneficiaries were not certified, and three (3) identification documents for the listed trust beneficiaries were not submitted as required in Legal Admissibility Evaluation Criteria 1.3, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document.
1	Kinetic Ovations Investment CC JV Excellent Inovation Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder completed eleven (11) forms of equipment owned but did not provide any proof of ownership from NATIS as per ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 2 of the Standard Bidding Document. The bidder submitted a Bank Letter which is not authentic and thus considered invalid as per ITB 12.1 (j) Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder submitted company profiles for both joint venture partners. However, Excellent Innovation Construction CC company profile is not comprehensive as there is no physical and postal address as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 5 of the Standard Bidding Document.
2	NGC investment CC JV Radial Truss Industries Pty Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted letters from suppliers providing 50% credit facilities but did not provide 50% of liquid assets from any Financial Institution as per ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document.
3	RJD Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder only provided one (1) completion certificate for similar works and not three (3) proof of completed projects as per Technical Evaluation Criteria requirement, item no. 3 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder did not provide any proof of credit facilities as required in ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder provided proof of similar projects. However, none of the projects met the required minimum value of N\$10 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 on page 36 of the Standard Bidding Document.
4	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder provided two (2) practical completion certificates of similar projects and not three (3) proof of completed projects as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 3 of the Standard Bidding Document.
5	Vero Group CC JV Tulu Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Foreman did not meet the required three (3) years' experience in similar works and the Health and Safety Officer did not meet the required five (5) years total work experience as required in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
6	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder submitted a bank letter which has a credit facility N\$4,955,000.00 and does not meet the required minimum amount of N\$7.5 million. Further, the letter was issued on the 27th May 2020 of which N\$1,650,000.00 has been utilized contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder submitted proof of similar works. However, there is no proof of project value provided to confirm that the bidder meets the required cumulative financial amount of N\$50 Million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the standard bidding document.
7	Penatu Trading CC JV Paulus Mweshipange Plant Hire and Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder provided proof of similar work amounting to N\$25.2 million but does not accumulate to a value of N\$50 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the standard bidding document.



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
8	JDN Civil Engineering CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Site Agent does not meet the required three (3) years of working experience in similar works as required in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder completed four (4) forms of equipment owned but did not provide any proof of ownership for three (3) of the equipment from NATIS as required in ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 2 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder did not provide any proof of credit facilities as required in ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder provided proof of similar work amounting to N\$17.8 million but does not accumulate to a value of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
10	James and Young Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted proof of similar works, but only one project meets a minimum value of N\$10 million. Therefore, the projects' value does not meet a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.
11	Kunene River Construction and Electrical CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Site Agent and Health & Safety Officer do not meet the requirement of three (3) years similar work experience as indicated in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder submitted proof of similar works, but only one project meets a minimum value of N\$10 million. Therefore, the projects' value does not meet a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
12	Capital Technical Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bidder provided liquid asset of N\$5 million which does not meet the required N\$7.5 million as per ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder submitted proof of similar works, but only provided proof of two projects which amounts to N\$28.4 million and does not meet a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.
15	Tatiana Trading Enterprise CC JV Onghushe Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Site Agent does not meet the required three (3) years of working experience in similar works as indicated in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder did not meet the requirement as they only provided 50% credit facility from suppliers and did not provide any proof of liquid assets as required in ITB 12.1 (j), Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 4 of the Standard Bidding Document.



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
17	Gongaleni Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder provided a proof of similar projects. However, none of the projects meet the required minimum value of N\$10 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Health and Safety Officer does not have the required three (3) years' experience in similar work as indicated in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. The Bidder submitted proof of similar work, but the projects do not amount to a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.
19	Teya Investments Number Eighteen CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not submit descriptive proof for the Foreman and Occupational Health and Safety Officer as required in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
20	Octagon Construction Pty Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bidder provided one (1) practical completion certificate of similar projects and not three (3) proof of completed projects as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 3 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder submitted proof of similar work, but the projects do not amount to a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder only provided two (2) practical completion certificates for similar works in the last five (5) years contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 3 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder submitted proof of similar works. However, there is no proof of project value provided to confirm that the projects amount to a cumulative amount of N\$50 million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.



Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Section 1.1: Preliminary Examination of Bids	Section 1.2: Eligibility Evaluation	Section 1.3: Legal Admissibility Evaluation	Section 1.4: Technical Evaluation Criteria	Section 2.0: Evaluation Scores	Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
22	M Shikongo's Investments Group CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Bidder did not comply with the requirement as the Foreman does not meet the required three (3) years' experiences in similar works as indicated in Table 2.5 personnel, Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 1 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder only provided two (2) practical completion certificates for similar works in the last five (5) years contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria, item no. 3 of the Standard Bidding Document. ▪ The Bidder submitted proof of works for similar nature. However, there is no proof of project value provided to confirm that the projects meet a cumulative financial amount of N\$50 Million as per Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.4, item no. 7 of the Standard Bidding Document.
16	I.D. Building Contractors CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
21	Namibia Construction Pty Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified

9

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

Bidder No	Bidder's Name	Bid Price Quoted (Excl. VAT) (N\$)	Bid Price Read-Out (Incl. VAT) (N\$)	Bid Price Corrected (Exc. VAT) (N\$)	Bid Price Corrected (Incl. VAT) (N\$)	Rank
16	I.D. Building Contractors CC	42,601,842.93	48,992,119.37	43,047,801.77	49,504,972.04	1
21	Namibia Construction (Pty) Ltd	50,713,429.91	58,320,444.40	51,019,060.27	58,671,919.32	2

15. Lowest Evaluated Bid(s)

Selected for Award of Contract:

Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.

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

Name: I.D. Building Contractors CC

Address: 13 Schubert Street Windhoek West, Namibia

Description		I.D. Building Contractors CC
Bid Price	Currency	Amount (Inclusive of VAT)
Bid Price Read-Out	N\$	48,992,119.37
Value of the Arithmetic Corrections	N\$	512,852.67
Discounts	N\$	None
Corrected & Proposed Award Amount	N\$	49,504,972.04

Bid Price, Excluding VAT: Forty-Three Million Forty-Seven Thousand Eight Hundred and One Namibia Dollars and Seventy-Seven Cents (N\$43,047,801.77)

Bid Price, Including VAT: Forty-Nine Million Five Hundred and Four Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Two Namibia Dollars and Four Cents (N\$49,504,972.04)

20 August 2021



P.P. Swartz
Chairperson



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM

**CONSTRUCTION OF NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL AT SWAKOPMUND IN THE ERONGO REGION –
PHASE 1**

(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. W/ONB/CPBN-08/2020)

I/We _____ hereby acknowledge receipt of this Notice for Selection of Procurement Award dated _____ and undertake to immediately return the signed acknowledgment of receipt to CPBN as proof of receipt.

Name: Signature:

Date: Company Stamp: