

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

1.	Name of Procurement	Provision of Landscaping and Gardening Services to the University of Namibia (UNAM) for a period three (3) years.
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2021
3.	Date of Submission of Report	25 August 2021
4.	Contract Number	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2021
5.	Scope of Contract	Provision of Landscaping and Gardening Services to the University of Namibia (UNAM) for a period three (3) years.
6.	Estimated Cost:	N\$ 21 875 303,35 (Incl. VAT)
7.	Funding Agency	University of Namibia (UNAM)
8.	Procurement Method Used	Open Advertised Bidding (Non-consultancy Services)
9.	Date of Invitation of Bids	24 September 2021
10.	Closing Date of Submission of Bids	1 November 2021
11.	Date and Place of Opening of Bids	1 November 2021, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	Number of Bids Received by Closing Date	Eighteen (18)

NB: Kindly note that this Executive Summary bears the reasons for disqualification after the re-evaluation process as ordered by the Review Panel on 27 July 2022 as well as the new developments related to the bidder's consent to extend their bid validity.

13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	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 Stages5	Financial Requirements Stages6	Financial Evaluation		
18	Roots Nursery & Garden Centre cc	X	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder responded late on 29 July 2022 after their bid expired on 28 July 2022. The request of extension of bid validity was issued on 25 July 2022 in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	
5	Greenfields Pesticides Development cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	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 Stage 4		
1	NAT Solutions cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; on page 34 of the bidding document. The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	
8	Kahoha Building Contractor cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, on page 34 of the bidding document. 	

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	Conflict of Interest	Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
				Eligibility Examination Phase 1	Preliminary/ Administrative Examination Phase 2	Mandatory Documents Examination Stage3	Technical Evaluation Stage5	Financial Requirements Stage6	Financial Evaluation		
											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document.
9	Cuisir Investment cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	
13	Economical Gardens Maintenance	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not attach the identification document, instead the bidder submitted the copy of the driver's 	

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	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	
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> license, contrary to ITB 5.3, of the bidding document. The bidder submitted only the first page of the founding statement, contrary to item 3.1 of the Mandatory Evaluation criteria, on page 33 of the bidding document.
15	Andre's Landscaping	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Instead, the bidder provided a letter of intent to lease a land to be used as a nursey from Safari Hotels. The letter submitted does not satisfy the requirements of a lease agreement as it lacks the following information:

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	Conflict of Interest	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage				Reasons why Bidder was not responsive		
				Stage 1					Stage 2	Stage 3
				Eligibility Examination Phase 1	Preliminary/ Administrative Examination Phase 2	Mandatory Documents Examination Stage3	Technical Evaluation Stage5	Financial Requirements Stage6	Financial Evaluation	
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The parties involved (Lessee & Lessor); Address of the property being leased; Duration of the lease; Lease amount; and Signature of both Lessee & Lessor
4	Rocky Construction cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 5%.
7	Artshilia Investment cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 60%. The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	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 Stages5	Financial Requirements Stage6	Financial Evaluation		
										July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document.	
10	Muthakaz Investment cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 40%. The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	
11	Shannon's Investment cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 45%. 	
12	Omdel Trading Enterprises cc	X	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 	

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Consent to Bid Validity Extension	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 Stages5	Financial Requirements Stages6	Financial Evaluation		
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of the bidding document. The bidder scored 40%. The bidder did not respond in writing to the request of extension of bid validity issued on 25 July in line with ITB 16.2 on page 14 of the bidding document. 	
14	Lizma Trading Enterprises cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not obtain the minimum valuation score of 70% or more out of 100 as stipulated on page 37 of the bidding document. However, the bidder scored 50%. 	
2	Berlyne Investment cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified	
3	Salon Africana cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified	
6	Giff Hamper Trading cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified	
16	Namibia Landscapes Ba Sharon Trading Enterprises cc	✓	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not disqualified	
17	Ba Sharon Trading Enterprises cc	✓	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	Bertlyne 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	No Quote received					
5	No Quote received					
6	No Quote received					
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	Bertlyne 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 above the cost estimate for the lot.
12	No Quote received					

**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	2	Bertyne Investments cc	1,189,275,38	None	1,189,275,38	18, Nissen-Lass street, Pioneerspark
7	16	Namibia landscapes	1,450,250.00	None	1,450,250.00	13, Liliencron Street, Eros, Windhoek
8	16	Namibia landscapes	927,270.00	None	927,270.00	13, Liliencron Street, Eros, Windhoek
9	2	Bertyne Investments cc	2,397,388.63	None	2,397,388.63	18, Nissen-Lass 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, 5, 6 and 12 were not quoted for and lot 11, the prices quoted by the bidder is above the lot's cost estimate.*

05 September 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: