



Procuring with Integrity

+264 (61) 447 700 pr@cpb.org.na www.cpb.org.na P.O. Box 23850 Mandume Park, 1 Tsenet Street, Windhoek, Namibia

## PART A

### NOTICE FOR SELECTION OF PROCUREMENT AWARD

(Section 55 (4) of the Act)

(Regulation 38(1))

<b>NOTICE FOR</b>	:	<b>PERIODIC MAINTENANCE OF GRAVEL ROADS: RE-GRAVELLING CONTRACT IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION (CONTRACTS: GRU-OTJ 01 &amp; GRU-OTJ 02), ON BEHALF OF ROADS AUTHORITY</b>
<b>Date</b>	:	<b>30 November 2021</b>
<b>Procurement Reference No</b>	:	<b>W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021</b>
<b>Contract Duration</b>	:	<b>Two (2) Years</b>

The Notice for Selection of Procurement Award is awarded as indicated in Table 1 Below, taking into consideration the bidding document requirement, which stated that where the ***“highest-rated Bidder in a given Contract Area has been recommended for another Contract Area, the Second-highest rated Bidder will be recommended”***.

Lot	Contract Price Including VAT	Name of the Successful Bidder	Address
LOT 1 – GRU OTJ	N\$89,909,534.96	Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd	111 Johan Albrecht, Windhoek Namibia
LOT 2 – GRU OTJ	N\$94,178,471.16	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC	Edison Street, Erf 4822 Swakopmund, Namibia

- Kindly note that, in terms of Section 55 of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015) and Regulation 38(1) of the Public Procurement Regulations (PPA), you have been selected for the award of this procurement contract referred to herein.
- Further note that, this Notice constitutes a final decision of the Board and in the absence of any application(s) for review by any of the unsuccessful bidder(s) to the Review Panel within the 7-day standstill period, the Accounting Officer will award the contract to you.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Mr P.P. Swartz (Chairperson), Ms L. Ramakutla (Deputy Chairperson), Ms J. !Garus-Oas, Ms E. Nghidipaa, Ms H. Herman, Mr O. Nangolo, Mr E. Shilongo, Mr M. Kambulu, Mr. A. Ngavetene, Ms. E. Shiponeni (Secretary to the Board)

- c) The standstill period referred to in paragraph (b) starts on 02 December 2021 at 08H00 AM and will end on 08 December 2021 at 17H00 PM (Namibian Time).
- d) Any application(s) for review referred to in paragraph (b) above, can be forwarded to the following electronic mail address: [kaarina.kashonga@mof.gov.na](mailto:kaarina.kashonga@mof.gov.na)



**PART B****NOTICE TO THE BIDDERS NOT SELECTED FOR AWARD**

<b>BIDDER NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF BIDDER NOT SELECTED FOR AWARD</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>
1	John Namusheshe Construction & Investment CC	Erf 5477 Industrial Area Ongwediva
2	KL Construction (Pty) Ltd	No 10 TV More Street Windhoek
3	Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd	Erf. 7 Oshakati Okahao Main Road
4	Oshikoto Building Construction CC	3 Wipstert Street, Khomasdal, Winddhoek
5	SUMSENO Contracting CC	PO Box 8403, Bachbrecht
6	Brumar Construction CC JV Otjomuise Construction CC	No.7 Von Auer Platz Ploersparl, Windhoek
7	ETN Technical Services CC	Erf 55121 EXTENSION 12 Ongwediva
8	New Success Investment CC	Unit 58 Pasteur Street, Windhoek
9	Denga Trading 230 CC JV Flame Investment CC	Po Box 2033, Windhoek, Namibia
10	Gongaleni Investment CC JV Truth Investment CC	Windhoek, Namibia
11	Refuse Solutions CC JV Phim Investment CC	Eistern Street Swakopmund
12	Kettu Trading Enterprises CC	Okaukete, Ondangwa
13	Odjove Trading & Construction (Pty) Ltd JV Royal Contractors CC	55 Von Marees Street, Vedersdal, Okahandja
14	Maperes Investment CC	Erf No 1129, Orwetuvani, Otjiwarongo
15	Roadhard CC	187 Independence Ave, Windhoek, Namibia
16	Gecko Fifty Eight Investment Group Pty (Ltd) JV Namibia Investments Contacts CC	Po Box 32417, Pionierspark, Windhoek
17	Namshine Investments CC	Unit 3, The Village Laather Street, Eros Windhoek
18	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	Unit 135 Maerua Mall, Windhoek, Namibia
19	Palladium Civil Engineering (Pty)Ltd	Klein Windhoek
20	Emirates Trading CC	4409 Lomel Street, Ongwediva
21	Windhoek Sandworx CC	PO Box 11588 Klein Windhoek
22	CSV Construction Namibia (Pty) Ltd	PO Box 86418 Eros Windhoek
23	Nexus Civils (Pty) Ltd	Corner of President & Krenz Stret Putjo, Namibia
24	Silvergate Enterprises CC JV Naftal Trading Enterprise CC	PO Box 21452, Windhoek, Namibia
25	Dunedin Investment CC JV Andjamba Construction CC	Windhoek, Namibia
26	Premier Construction CC JV FA Developers CC	Erf 2599 Tulinawa, Swakopmund
27	Globex Investment CC JV Pisces Investment Holdings Number Eight CC	No.5 Blackbird Court, Hochlandpark, Windhoek
28	Earth Ethicks Construction CC	15 Garten Street, Ausspanplatz, Windhhoek
29	Namibbeton (Pty) Ltd	Plot 388 Braakwater Windhoek
30	NGC Investment CC JV Neu-Olulya Trading CC	10 Johann Albrecht Street, Windhoek-west
31	Brandberg Construction CC	81 Nickel Street, Prosperita, Windhoek
33	Potenza Investment CC	281 Osswegia, Otjiwarongo
34	Erongo Quarry & Civil Works (Pty) Ltd	2680 Corner of Hidipo Hamutenya & Hepltz Road, Walvisbay, Namibia

BIDDER NO.	NAME OF BIDDER NOT SELECTED FOR AWARD	ADDRESS
35	Otesa Civil Engineering (Pty) Ltd JV Namibia Construction (Pty) Ltd	26 New Castle Street, Northern Industrial Ara, Windhoek Namibia
36	Tulu Trading Enterprises CC, Vero Group, NCCS Investment Holdings (Pty) Ltd JV	9 Elder Street, Lafrenz, Windhoek
37	Ndakalimwe Investment CC JV Zero Six Five Trading CC	9 Elder Street, Lafrenz, Windhoek

- a) The price offered by the bidders referred to in paragraph (a) are an amount of **N\$89,909,534.96** (Including VAT) for Lot 1 – GRU OTJ and **N\$94,178,471.16** for Lo 2 – GRU OTJ respectively.
- b) The criteria used to select the award of the bidders referred to in paragraph (a) is set out in the bidding document reference number: **W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021**.
- c) Further note that, this Notice constitutes a final decision of the Board and in the absence of any application(s) for review by any of the unsuccessful bidder(s) to the Review Panel within the 7-day standstill period, the Accounting Officer will award the contract to you.
- d) The standstill period referred to in paragraph (b) starts on 02 December 2021 at 08H00 AM and will end on 08 December 2021 at 17H00 PM (Namibian Time).
- e) Any application(s) for review referred to in paragraph (b) above, can be forwarded to the following electronic mail address: [kaarina.kashonga@mof.gov.na](mailto:kaarina.kashonga@mof.gov.na)

  
**P.P Swartz**  
**CHAIRPERSON**



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM**

**PERIODIC MAINTENANCE OF GRAVEL ROADS: RE-GRAVELLING CONTRACT IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION (CONTRACTS: GRU-OTJ 01 & GRU-OTJ 02)**

**(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021.)**

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: .....



Procuring with integrity

+254 (81) 442 700    pr@cpb.org.na    www.cpb.org.na    P.O. Box 23660    Mandume Park, 1 Tsewete Street Windhoek, Namibia

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

1.	<b>Name of Procurement</b>	Periodic Maintenance of Gravel Roads: Re-Gravelling Contract in the Otjiwarongo Region (Contracts: GRU-OTJ 01 & GRU-OTJ 02) on behalf of Roads Authority
2.	<b>CPBN Procurement Reference No</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021
3.	<b>Date of Submission of Report</b>	18 November 2021
4.	<b>Contract Number</b>	W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021
5.	<b>Scope of Contract</b>	Special Conditions of Contract
6.	<b>Estimated Cost:</b>	N\$195,959,475.90 (Inc. VAT)
7.	<b>Funding Agency</b>	Roads Authority
8.	<b>Procurement Method Used</b>	Open Advertised Bidding (Works)
9.	<b>Date of Invitation of Bids</b>	22 February 2021
10.	<b>Closing Date of Submission of Bids</b>	5 April 2021
11.	<b>Date and Place of Opening of Bids</b>	5 April 2021, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	<b>Number of Bids Received by Closing Date</b>	Thirty-eight (38)

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD:** Mr P.P. Swartz (Chairperson), Ms L. Ramakhotla (Deputy Chairperson), Ms J. !Garus-Oas, Ms E. Nghiidipaa, Ms H. Herman, Mr O. Nangolo, Mr E. Shilongo, Mr M. Kambulu, Mr. A. Ngavetene, Ms. E. Shiponeni (Secretary to the Board)

13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	Bid Validity	
17	Namshine Investments CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not initial page 209 of the bidding document. The bidder only signed page 139 where there was space for signature contrary to Section III-Evaluation criteria-1.5.1, item No. 3.</li> <li>The bidder did not initial the entire BOQ attached as an annexure on its own contrary to Section III-Evaluation Criteria-1.5.1, item No. 3.</li> </ul>
11	Refuse Solutions JV Phim Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a letter of intent to form a JV however, the letter did not indicate all the requirements as set out in Section III, Evaluation Criteria-1.5.3, item No. 7. The Letter only speaks to 50% of partner shares in the JV and not Roles and Responsibilities of each party, JV's bank account nor if the Bidder intends to open up a Bank account for the JV and no clause that speaks about the partners being jointly and severely liable.</li> </ul>
22	CSV Construction Namibia (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>John Hamilton Cillum who owns shares of 38.39% in the company did not submit an ID. It was however, indicated that John Hamilton Cillum and Intel Construction &amp; Maintenance Services have South</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
								<p>African nationalities on the Company shareholder information form on page 71 of the bidding document contrary to Section III-Evaluation Criteria 1.5.3, item No. 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bidder attached Certificate of incorporation for a company called Luckhoff Investment (Pty) Ltd, the bidder also submitted Document from the Bidders lawyer dated 2017 indicating percentage of shares and shareholders stating the company change of name however, the bidder did not submit proper/updated documentation from BIPA for CSV Construction Namibia showing change of name.</li> <li>The Committee noted that Intel Construction &amp; Maintenance services owned 7.41% shares in CSV Construction Namibia (Pty) Ltd however, the bidder did not submit founding statement nor any documentation for that company, hence nationality could not be determined in that regard. (Section III-Evaluation Criteria 1.5.3, item No. 1).</li> </ul>
26	Premier Construction CC JV FA	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder did not submit ID for Willem Arrie Van Der Plas who owns 80% shares in the company, as a result</li> </ul>



Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
	Developers CC							the bidder was deemed non-responsive in respect of criteria 1.5.3(1), that required the bidder to provide valid proof of citizenship in the form of Namibian Identity Documents.
36	Tulu Trading Enterprises CC JV Vero Group JV NCCS Investment Holdings (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vero Group CC did not submit an original nor a copy of a Good Standing TAX Certificate as required in criteria 3 under 1.5.3, the bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive as each JV partner was required to submit an original or certified copy of valid Good Standing TAX Certificate.</li> <li>Vero Group CC did not submit an original nor a copy of a Good Standing Social Security Certificate as required in criteria 4 under 1.5.3, the bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive as each JV partner was required to submit an original or certified copy of valid Good Standing Social Security Certificate.</li> </ul>
1	John Namusheshe Construction & Investment	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder Submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the bidder did not perform a project within the last 9 years in similar type and size (Re-gravelling, earthworks, maintenance of gravel roads and</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	Bid Validity	
		Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Score	Financial Evaluation		
									<p>construction of gravel roads) with a cumulative value of N\$32,659,913 (Section III-Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4, item No. 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project The Labour Base Construction Namibia Road Production, Project Amount: 21,842,914.46, Project Period: 2011, the Completion certificate came from the main contractor instead of the Principal Agent / Project Manager / Engineer who has supervised the works. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 3 and 4 under technical evaluation 1.5.4.</li> </ul>
3	Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Completion Certificate submitted only indicated Project Name &amp; Project Period but did not indicate the Project amount. The technical Evaluation criteria 1.5.4 (4) required the certificate to indicate both amount, name, and period.</li> </ul>
4	Oshikoto Building Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder Submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the bidder submitted a list of work within the last 9 years in similar type and size (Re-gravelling, earthworks, maintenance of gravel roads and construction of gravel roads) with a cumulative value of N\$ 32,659,913 but there was no</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						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	Evaluation Score	Financial Evaluation		Bid Validity
5	SUMSENSO Contracting CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>completion certificate attached to verify the list of works listed. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in line with Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record of similar size however, not of similar nature. The project record that was accompanied by a letter from the Engineer who supervised the works were of similar size but not of similar nature. The Completion Certificate only indicated the Project Name; and Project Period but did not indicate Project amount as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4) to indicate all three.</li> </ul>
7	ETN Technical Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record of similar size but not similar type/nature as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
8	New Success Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the bidder's project record indicated project of similar type, but the projects were not of the same size with a cumulative value of N\$32,659,913 as required in</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
9	Denga Trading 230 CC JV Flame Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Technical Evaluation criteria 1.5.4 (4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted comprehensive company profile and project record but not of similar type and size projects. The largest Project amount done by the bidder was worth N\$18.4 million (Etosha elephant security fence) but it was not of the same type and nature. The bidder was required to have a project with a cumulative value of N\$32,659,913 in terms of Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
10	Gongaleni Investment CC JV Truth Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record for similar size but not of similar type projects (Re-gravelling, earthworks, maintenance of gravel roads and construction of gravel roads) as per Section III-Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4, item No. 4.</li> </ul>
12	Kettu Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the project was not of similar type and size as indicated on the letter from the Principal Agent who has supervised the works. The bidder was a subcontractor on a project and the</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	Bid Validity	
	Preliminary Examination	Eligibility Evaluation	Legal Admissibility	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Score	Financial Evaluation		
								works included cleaning and grubbing, pavement layers, drains, culverts and multi-cell erosion protection, these jobs weren't considered as similar works. The bidder's highest similar project completed was N\$27,816,813.00 and not of a cumulative value of N\$32,659,913 as in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).
13	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record for similar type of project however the projects were not of same size with a cumulative value of N\$32,659,912.00 as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
14	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record for similar type/nature, but not similar size with a cumulative value N\$32,659,912.00 as required in Technical Evaluation criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
16	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder Submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record but was not of similar type and size as indicated on the</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
	Group Ply (Ltd) JV							letter from the Principal Agent who supervised the works, the bidder did a project of upgrading a road of Ofjipumbu however, the completion certificate did not indicate project amount as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4.(4).
21	Windhoek Sandworx CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder did not submit a comprehensive company profile and project record for previous work done as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (3).</li> <li>The bidder did not submit a comprehensive company profile and project record for similar type and size projects nor letters from the Principal Agent / Project Manager / Engineer who has supervised the works as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
24	Silvergate Enterprises CC JV Naftal Trading Enterprise CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the letters from the Principal Agent who supervised the works did not indicate; project amount and project period as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
25	Dunedin Investment CC JV Andjamba Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the project were not of similar type and size nor were they accompanied by a letter from the Principal Agent/Project Manager/Engineer who supervised the works as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
27	Globex Investment CC JV Pisces Investment Holdings Number Eight CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record, however, the projects were not of similar type and size, the bidder only did minor project Road Maintenance of Bitumen maintenance and the Highest project was approximately N\$11 million, contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
28	Earth Ethicks Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the projects were not of similar type and size as contained in the bidding documents. The bidder only did minor project, and the Highest project was approximately N\$10 million, contrary</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	
								to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).
30	NGC Investment CC JV Neu-Olulya Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder Submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the project was not for similar type and size projects as required in Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
33	Potenza Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the projects were not of similar type and size. The highest project in terms of amount was worth N\$13 million, contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
37	Ndakalimwe Investment CC JV Zero Six Five Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder submitted a comprehensive company profile and project record however, the projects were not for similar type and size. The highest project in terms of amount was worth approximately N\$13 million, contrary to Technical Evaluation Criteria 1.5.4 (4).</li> </ul>
15	Roadhard CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder was deemed non-responsive because they did not</li> </ul>



Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive	
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation		Bid Validity
							responsive & disqualified		respond to the email to give consent to the extension of the Bid validity, referenced in ITB 19.1 which states that "Bids shall remain valid for the period specified in the BDS after the bid submission deadline date prescribed by the Procuring Agent. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected by the Procuring Agent as non-responsive"
19	Palladium Civil Engineering (Pty)Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder was deemed non-responsive because they did not respond to the email to give consent to the extension of the Bid validity, referenced in ITB 19.1 which states that "Bids shall remain valid for the period specified in the BDS after the bid submission deadline date prescribed by the Procuring Agent. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected by the Procuring Agent as non-responsive"</li> </ul>
34	Erongo Quarry & Civil Works (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bidder was deemed non-responsive because they did not respond to the email to give consent to the extension of the Bid validity, referenced in ITB 19.1 which states that "Bids shall remain valid for the period specified in the BDS after the bid submission deadline date prescribed by the Procuring Agent as non-responsive"</li> </ul>

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation	Bid Validity	
									<i>bid submission deadline date prescribed by the Procuring Agent. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected by the Procuring Agent as non-responsive"</i>
2	2 KL Construction (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
6	Brumar Construction CC JV Ojumuise Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
18	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
20	Emirates Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
23	Nexus Civils (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
29	Namibbeton (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
31	Brandberg Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
32	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive	
		Stage 1 Preliminary Examination	Stage 2 Eligibility Evaluation	Stage 3 Legal Admissibility	Stage 4 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Stage 5 Evaluation Score	Stage 6 Financial Evaluation		Bid Validity
35	Namibia Construction (Pty) Ltd JV Otessa Civil Engineering (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified
38	Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	• Bidder not disqualified

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

##### LOT 1 – GRU OTJ:

No	Bidder's Name	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Bid Price After Corrections (N\$)	Price After Margin of Preference (if applicable) N\$	Ranking
38	Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd	89,909,534.96	89,909,534.96	None	1
32	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC	105,473,628.71	105,473,628.71	None	2
20	Emirates Trading CC	109,198,687.69	109,198,687.69	None	3
6	J Brumar Construction CC	109,236,985.16	114,873,062.22	None	4
	V Otjomuise Construction CC				
18	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	125,716,455.00	126,083,305.00	None	5
23	Nexus Civils (Pty) Ltd	126,988,826.36	126,988,826.36	None	6
29	Namibbeton (Pty) Ltd	134,947,550.20	134,947,553.65	None	7
35	J Namibia Construction (Pty) Ltd	136,365,550.32	136,365,550.32	None	8
	V Otesa Civil Engineering (Pty) Ltd				
31	Brandberg Construction CC	134,859,709.62	140,057,797.84	None	9
2	KL Construction (Pty) Ltd	91,217,836.90	148,835,529.54	None	10

##### LOT 2 – GRU OTJ:

No	Bidder's Name	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Bid Price After Corrections (N\$)	Price After Margin of Preference (if applicable) N\$	Ranking
38	Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd	86,861,289.67	86,861,289.67	None	1
32	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC	94,178,471.16	94,178,471.16	None	2
6	J Brumar Construction CC	96,046,434.21	99,586,093.08	None	3
	V Otjomuise Construction CC				
20	Emirates Trading CC	113,501,553.16	113,721,966.76	None	4
18	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	114,996,991.89	115,360,391.89	None	5
23	Nexus Civils (Pty) Ltd	116,339,433.69	116,339,433.69	None	6
35	J Namibia Construction (Pty) Ltd	124,378,185.74	124,378,185.74	None	7
	V Otesa Civil Engineering (Pty) Ltd				
2	KL Construction (Pty) Ltd	85,217,412.21	126,992,800.88	None	8
29	Namibbeton (Pty) Ltd	127,475,795.53	127,475,795.53	None	9
31	Brandberg Construction CC	132,561,656.24	135,845,449.09	None	10

**15. BEST EVALUATED BID(S): LOT 1**

**Selected For Award of Contract:**

**Best Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.**

Given the 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 Public Procurement Act, 2015.

<b>LOT NO.</b>	<b>Bidder No.</b>	<b>Bidder's Name</b>	<b>Address</b>
<b>LOT 1 – GRU OTJ:</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd</b>	<b>111 Johan Albrecht, Windhoek Namibia</b>

<b>LOT 1 – GRU OTJ:</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>Currency</b>	<b>Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd</b>
<b>Bid Price</b>	<b>N\$</b>	<b>Amount (Including VAT)</b>
<b>Bid Price(s) Read-Out</b>	<b>N\$</b>	<b>89,909,534.96</b>
<b>Corrections of Errors</b>	<b>N\$</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Discounts</b>	<b>N\$</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Proposed Award</b>	<b>N\$</b>	<b>89,909,534.96</b>

**Bid price, including VAT:** Eighty-Nine Million, Nine Hundred and Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Thirty-Four Namibia Dollars and Ninety-Six Cents (N\$89,909,534.96).



**16. BEST EVALUATED BID(S): LOT 2**

**Selected For Award of Contract:  
Best Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.**

In line with the bidding document requirement, which stated that where the "**highest-rated Bidder in a given Contract Area has been recommended for another Contract Area, the Second-highest rated Bidder will be recommended**".

In view of the above and the 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 Public Procurement Act, 2015.

LOT NO.	Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Address
LOT 2 – GRU OTJ:	32	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC	Edison Street, Erf 4822 Swakopmund, Namibia

LOT 2 – GRU OTJ:		
Description	Currency	Quiver Tree Investments 13 CC
Bid Price	N\$	Amount (Including VAT)
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	94,178,471.16
Corrections of Errors	N\$	0.00
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	94,178,471.16

**Bid price, including VAT:** Ninety-Four Million, One Hundred and Seventy-Eight Thousand, Four Hundred and Seventy-One Namibia Dollars and Sixteen Cents (N\$94,178,471.16).

30 November 2021

  
P.P. Swartz  
Chairperson



**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM**

**PERIODIC MAINTENANCE OF GRAVEL ROADS: RE-GRAVELLING CONTRACT IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION (CONTRACTS: GRU-OTJ 01 & GRU-OTJ 02)**

**(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. W/OAB/CPBN-02/2021.)**

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: .....