



Procuring with Integrity

+264 (0) 447 700 pr@cpb.org.na www.cpb.org.na P.O Box 23650 Erf 5161, Julius Nyerere Street Windhoek, Namibia

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

1.	Name of Procurement	Construction of Otavi Primary School in Otavi on Behalf of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	W/OAB/CPBN-07/2020
3.	Date of Submission of Report	18 November 2021
4.	Contract Number	W/ONB/CPBN-07/2020
5.	Scope of Contract	Special Conditions of Contract
6.	Estimated Cost:	N\$59,129,625.90 (Inc. VAT)
7.	Funding Agency	Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture
8.	Procurement Method Used	Open Advertised Bidding (Works) as per Section 27 (1)(a) (i) read together with section 28 (2) and section 2 (b) of the Public Procurement Act, 15 of 2015.
9.	Date of Invitation of Bids	9 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)

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: Mr P.P. Swartz (Chairperson), Ms L. Ramakhutla (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
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
1	Joto Investment CC JV Omagumbo Construction CC JV Reality Investment CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not submit part three (3) Condition of the Contract and Contract forms of the SBD. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of the criteria in reference to ITB 29.1(c) One page of the Key Personnel's CV was not initialled and as such the bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.1.3
2	Kinetic Ovations Investment CC JV Excellent Renovation & Construction CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authorised person did not fully initial the specialist installation bidding documents (ITB Clause 21.2), except for volume 4.
3	TJ Civil Technology JV Mascon Investment CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial the Social Security Commission good standing certificate, the Employment Equity Commission letter and Tax good standing certificate, as per ITB Clause 21.2.
6	Onyof Trading Enterprises CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial all the pages in Vol 2,3,4,5 and 6 of the specialist installation bid documents. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.1.3 as per ITB Clause 21.2.
8	JDN Civil Engineering CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial all the pages in Vol 2,3,4,5 and 6 of the specialist installation bid documents. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.1.3 as per ITB Clause 21.2.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
								non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.1.3 as per ITB Clause 21.2.
15	Teya Investments No18 CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial page 117 of the bidding document, page 2 of addendum 2 and all pages of volume 2, as per ITB Clause 21.2.
16	Uri Trading Enterprises CC JV Puturi Construction CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial the mandatory documents pages, key personnel CV page and qualification as required in evaluation criteria 1.1.3 and ITB Clause 21.2.
18	New Success Investment CC	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial all the pages in Vol 2,3,4,5 and 6 of the specialist installation bid documents. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in evaluation criteria 1.1.3 as per ITB Clause 21.2. The bidder did not initial the last page of the 2017 Annual Financial Statement.
22	Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not initial the Social Security good standing certificate The bidder did not initial the Tax good standing certificate as per ITB Clause 21.2. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of evaluation criteria 1.1.3, as per ITB Clause 21.2.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
11	Tatiana Trading Enterprises CC JV Onghushe Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee observed that the JV Agreement was signed by two parties. However, the Committee noted that under the signature of JV partner Tatiana Trading Enterprises CC, there was a name written "Nakutumba", whereby it was found after careful review that this name and signature are not consistent with the submitted ID, founding statement and the JV agreement. The committee found that this inconsistency was not legally admissible.
7	James and Young Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not submit proof from a Financial Institution stating lines of credit, however the bidder indicated to have a credit line from Financial Institution on Form FIN 3.3 on page 66 of the bidding document, but the Committee could not find proof of such financial resources as stated in the form. Evaluation criteria 1.4.7 required the projects to amount to a cumulative financial value of N\$ 40 million, however, the bidder's cumulative projects amount was only valued at N\$29 million, the bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive in terms of criteria 1.4.7.
9	Florida Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder submitted a list of similar works carried out over the last five years however, the list was not accompanied with signed

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
								<p>letter and or practical completion or completion certificates. One project worth N\$ 25 million had a reference letter however, it was not signed by the project manager as required in criteria, 1.4.3 and was rather signed by the bidders JV partner for that specific project. This letter was not considered either.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder submitted a list of similar works carried out by the bidder over the last five years but did not amount to a cumulative financial amount of N\$ 40 million. Amongst the projects submitted, there was a construction of Osona Houses project worth N\$ 21 million and another project for the renovation and furnishment of the Concordia High school worth approximately N\$ 25 million however, there was no practical or Completion certificates for both projects. The bidder has no projects with cumulative financial amount of N\$ 40 million as required in Technical evaluation criteria 1.4.7. The rest of the projects the bidder submitted were not considered as they were not works of similar nature. The bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive.
12	Octagon Construction (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder submitted Practical completion certificates. Only one is for similar works

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
								(building works). The rest of the projects are either civil or electrical works (not similar works). Other projects listed by the bidder are not supported by signed completion or practical completion certificates as required by evaluation criteria 1.4.3 of the bidding document. The bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive.
13	Ongoma Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted a list of work of similar nature (size/value, type) in the last five years however, amongst all the projects, only two (2) projects worth N\$ 33.6 million could be validated, but the projects did not amount to the cumulative amount of N\$ 40 million as required in evaluation criteria 1.4.7 of the bidding document.
14	Adaptive Building Land Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder only submitted two projects accompanied by Practical Completion Certificates for similar works (Building construction works). The other projects listed were not accompanied with signed letter and or practical completion or completion certificates. Two other projects submitted were civil works project, which did not meet the criteria of being similar works. The bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of evaluation criteria 1.4.3 on page 35 of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
	(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
17	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder did not submit Statements from a Financial Institution stating credit line from any financial institution, the bidder only submitted a Letter of Intent from a supplier's stating line of credit of N\$ 10 million which did not meet the requirement of ITB 12.1(j)(ii) of having 100% Liquid Assets combined. The Bidder did not also meet 50% credit facilities from suppliers and 50% liquid assets amount that will allow the bidder to perform the construction works. ITB 12.1 (J)(ii) required either 100% liquid assets or the bidder to have at least 50% of each, the bidder was also deemed not responsive in this regard. The Bidder submitted a list of similar works carried out over the last five years with practical completion certificates, however, all the project listed by the bidder were not of similar size and type. The bidder only had one project of similar work which was a construction of Rehoboth Build for Insignia Retail to the value of N\$ 11 million. The Bidder submitted a list of similar works with practical completion certificates, however, all the project listed by the bidder were not of similar size and type. The majority of the projects were civil and bulk electrical projects and not building works as

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
								required in evaluation criteria 1.4.7 of the bidding document.
19	Gongaleni Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted a list of works of similar nature (size/value,type) in the last five years, however the projects only amounted to N\$35.4 million and did not amount to a cumulative amount of N\$40 million as required in evaluation criteria 1.4.7, thus the Bidder was deemed non-responsive.
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder attached two (2) Practical completion Certificates for the Construction of Build It Omuthiya and Build it Okahandja, yet no project value was provided. The Bidder was deemed non-responsive in terms of evaluation criteria 1.4.3 of the bidding document.
20	Ibuild Supplies (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted a list of works of similar nature (size/value, type) in the last five years, however the Bidder only provided a completion certificate of a project that amounted to N\$ 15.6 million and the other project did not have certificate of completion. The requirement for a cumulative amount of N\$40 million was not met as required in evaluation criteria 1.4.7, thus the Bidder was deemed non-responsive.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage						Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		(Stage1) Preliminary Examination	(Stage2) Eligibility Evaluation	(Stage3) Legal Admissibility	(Stage4) Technical Evaluation Criteria	(Stage5) Evaluation Score	(Stage6) Financial Evaluation	
21	Vero Group CC JV Tulu Trading Enterprises CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not responsive & disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder submitted Statements from a Financial Institution stating lines of credit to the value of N\$ 1.65 million from Bank Windhoek and N\$1.35 million which did not meet the requirement of ITB 12.1(j)(ii) of having 100% liquid assets combined. The bidder did not also meet evaluation criteria 1.4.4 in reference to ITB 12.1 (J)(ii) that requires either 100% liquid assets or the bidder to have at least 50% of each, the bidder was therefore deemed non-responsive.
4	ID Building Contractors CC	Responsive	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified
5	Capital Technical Services CC	Responsive	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified
10	Nexus Building Contractors (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified

14. Price for the Substantial Responsive Bid(s)

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
4	ID Building Contractors CC	51,416,929.33	51,166,019.58	None	1
10	Nexus Building Contractors (Pty) Ltd	52,134,305.43	52,134,307.38	None	2
5	Capital Technical Services CC	54,003,638.91	53,771,881.97	None	3

15. Best Evaluated Bid(s)

Select For Award of Contract:

Best Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.

The Board resolved to approve as per the recommendation(s) of the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC), in terms of Section 9 (1) (k) and (l) (i) and Section 55 (6) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Address
4	ID Building Contractors CC	Address: 13 Schubert Street, Windhoek

Description	Currency	ID Building Contractors CC
Bid Price	N\$	Amount (Including VAT)
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	51,416,929.33
Corrections of Errors	N\$	(250,909.66)
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	51,166,019.58

Bid price, including VAT: Fifty-One Million One Hundred Sixty-Six Thousand Nineteen Namibia Dollars and Fifty-Eight Cents (N\$ 51,166,019.58).

08 February 2022


P.P. Swartz
Chairperson



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM

**CONSTRUCTION OF OTAVI PRIMARY SCHOOL IN OTAVI ON BEHALF OF MINISTRY
OF EDUCATION, ARTS AND CULTURE**

(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO: W/ONB/CPBN-07/2020)

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: