

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

1.	Name of Procurement	Request for Proposal for the Appointment of a Consultant (Firm) to Support, Maintain and Enhance the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS) for a period of Five (5) Years for the Ministry of Finance
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	SC/RFP/CPBN-01 /2026
3.	Date of Approval of the Report	17 September 2026
4.	Contract Number	SC/RFP/CPBN-01 /2026
5.	Scope of Contract	General Conditions of Contract
6.	Funding Agency	Ministry of Finance
7.	Procurement Method Used	Request for Proposal (RFP)
8.	Date of Invitation of Bids	16 June 2026
9.	Initial Closing Date of Submission of Bids	07 July 2026
10.	Closing Date of Submission of Bids	28 July 2026
11.	Date and Place of Opening of Bids	28 July 2026, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia (Bid Opening Room)
12.	Number of Bids Received by Closing Date – 28 July 2026	Four (4)
13.	Number of Financial Proposal Received on 15 September 2026	Two (2)

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:

Ms. M. Shiimi (Chairperson) | Mr. A. Collard | Ms. J. !Garus-Oas | Mr. I. Kadhila | Ms. L. Kazetjikuria | Mr. S. Shivute
| Mr. P. Tshiningayamwe | Mr. I. Itope (CEO) | Ms. E. Shiponeni (Corporate Governance Practitioner)

48

14. RESPONSIVENESS OF BID(S):

Bid No.	Name of the Consultant(s)	SHORTLISTING CRITERIA/EVALUATION CRITERIA						Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/Administrative Evaluation	Mandatory Documents evaluation of the bids	Legal Admissibility	Technical Requirements Evaluation	Financial Evaluation	
1	Cloud Namibia Network and Hardware Supplies CC JV Ekwantu Consulting (PTY) Ltd	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The consultant failed to comply with the Preliminary Examination criteria # 2.2 and ITB 4.2 on page 60 of the bidding document because: • Pages 130, and 131 of bidding document were initiated by an unauthorized person. The consultant failed to comply with the Preliminary Examination criteria # 2.2 and ITB 4.2 on page 60 of the bidding document because: • The consultant did not initial the Statement of Exclusivity and Availability for Mpho Mashele System Analyst, Ekwantu Consulting (PTY) Ltd, and page 12 of the bidding document.
2	RPC Data Limited JV TwinRain Technology Solutions (PTY) Ltd	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The consultant failed to comply with the Preliminary Examination criteria # 2.2 and ITB 4.2 on page 60 of the bidding document because: • The Contract Agreement on page 4 of 45 is initiated by an unauthorized person.
3	Syntex Information Technologies (PTY) Ltd JV Catalyst Business Partners Limited Liability Company (LLC)	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Consultant not disqualified
4	Silnam Information Technology Solutions (Pty) Limited	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Consultant not disqualified

f

15. PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BID(S)

The BEC evaluated two (2) consultancies that were substantially responsive under financial evaluation on page 67 of the bidding document. The BEC ranked the consultants according to the price quoted from the lowest to the highest, and the contracts will be awarded to the lowest evaluated substantially responsive bid in terms of Section 55 (1) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015), as amended.

15.1 FINANCIAL EVALUATION: BID PRICES AFTER ARITHMETIC ERROR CALCULATIONS:

Consultant No.	Consultant's Name	Price at Bid Closure (VAT exclusive) (N\$)	Difference (N\$)	Arithmetically corrected bid price (VAT exclusive) (N\$)
3	Syntex Information Technologies (Pty) Ltd JV Catalyst Business Partners Limited Liability Company (LLC)	6,800,000.00	0.00	6,800,000.00
4	Silnam Information Technology Solutions (Pty) Limited	7,560,000.00	0.00	7,560,000.00

15.2 PRICE COMPARISON AND, FINANCIAL EVALUATION AND RANKING AS ON PAGE 67 OF THE BIDDING DOCUMENT:

#	Consultant's Name	Price at Bid Closure (Excluding VAT) per Year (N\$)	Bid Price (VAT inclusive) per Year (N\$)	Public Entity Budget (N\$) VAT incl	Ranking
3	Syntex Information Technologies (Pty) Ltd JV Catalyst Business Partners Limited Liability Company (LLC)	6,800,000.00	7,820,000.00	8,400,000.00	1
4	Silnam Information Technology Solutions (Pty) Limited	7,560,000.00	8,694,000.00		2

8

16. BEST EVALUATED BID(S)

Selected for Award of Contract:

Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.

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) guideline of the Public Procurement Act, 2015, as amended.

Consultant's No.	Consultant's Name	Proposed Award Amount (VAT Inclusive) (N\$) per year	Public Entity Budget (VAT inclusive) (N\$) per year	Remark(s)	Physical Address
3	Syntex Information Technologies (PTY) Ltd JV Catalyst Business Partners Limited Liability Company (LLC)	7,820,000.00	8,400,000.00	Recommended	Office No. 303 C, 3rd Floor, Battuta Gate Offices, Dubai/ 340 Sam Nujoma Drive, Klein Windhoek
4	Silnam Information Technology Solutions (PTY) Limited	8,694,000.00			351 Independence Avenue, 1st Floor, Otjikoto Building, Windhoek

18 September 2026


Ms. Mary Shiimi
CHAIRPERSON

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM	
THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A CONSULTANT (FIRM) TO SUPPORT, MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE INTEGRATED FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (IFMS) FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE (5) YEARS FOR THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO.: SC/RFP/CPBN-01 /2026)	
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:	

8