



Procuring with Integrity

+264 (61) 447 700 pr@cpb.org.na www.cpb.org.na P.O. Box 23650 Maridome Park, 1 Tenert Street, Windhoek, Namibia

PART A

NOTICE FOR SELECTION OF PROCUREMENT AWARD

(Section 55 of Act)

(Regulation 39(1))

AWARD NOTICE FOR : **PROCUREMENT OF RENDERING OF SECURITY AND FIDELITY TRANSITO SERVICES TO THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

Date: : **28 July 2020**

Procurement Reference No : **NCS/ONB/CPBN-01/2020**

Contract price for Lot 2 : **N\$12,967,593.52 (Including VAT)**

Name of successful bidder for Lot 2 : **Royal Security Services CC**

Address : **Unit S5
EPZ Industrial Area
Katima Mulilo
Namibia**

Contract price for Lot 3 : **N\$4,842,011.52 (Including VAT)**

Name of successful bidder for Lot 3 : **Omeya Investments CC**

Address : **No. 8456
Sam Nujoma Drive
Windhoek
Namibia**

Contract price for Lot 4 : **N\$5,079,472.12 (Including VAT)**
Name of successful bidder for Lot 4 : **Royal Security Services CC**
Address : **Unit S5
EPZ Industrial Area
Katima Mulilo
Namibia**

- a) Kindly note that, in terms of Section 55 of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015) and Regulation 39 (1) of the Public Procurement Regulations, you have been selected for the award of this procurement contract referred to herein.
- b) Kindly further note that in the absence of application for review of the selection for award with the Central Procurement Board of Namibia (CPBN), within the seven (7) days standstill period by any unsuccessful bidder(s), the Accounting Officer, in terms of Section 55 (5) of the Public Procurement Act will award this Procurement Contract to you.
- c) The standstill period referred to in paragraph (b), starts on 29 July 2020 at 08H00 AM and ends on 04 August 2020 at 17H00 PM (Namibian Time).
- d) Any application for review referred to in paragraph (b) above, can be forwarded to the following electronic mail address: Reconsiderations@cpb.org.na

NB: Lot 1: Bidders to note that Lot 1 of this bid was not awarded due to non-responsiveness in terms of Section 54 (1)(a) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No.15 of 2015). The Board resolved to refer this procurement to the Ministry of Finance for re-advertisement.



PART B

NOTICE TO THE BIDDERS NOT SELECTED FOR AWARD

KANGARU TRADING EXPRESS CC

CIS SECURITY SERVICES CC

AMON ASN INVESTMENTS CC

MUKWE SECURITY SERVICES CC

JUPITER SECURITY CC

EXTRA DEFENSE PROTECTION SERVICES CC

ALERT SECURITY SERVICES CC

OMBANDJE SECURITY SERVICES CC

OMBALA SECURITY SERVICES CC

NKASA SECURITY SERVICES CC

SPLASH INVESTMENTS CC

SALAMBALA INVESTMENTS CC

WINDHOEK SECURITY SERVICES CC

BERTHA SECURITY SERVICES CC

OMLE SECURITY SERVICES CC

MAMPI SECURITY SERVICES CC

MPUNGU SECURITY CC

TULIKUMO INVESTMENTS CC

SHILIMELA SECURITY AND DEBT COLLECTION CC

SIX THOUSAND SECURITY SERVICES CC

CHIEF NANGOLO SECURITY SERVICES CC

AFRICA INVESTMENT CC

SHIKUVULE TRADING CC

- a) Kindly note that the bidders whose particulars are specified in PART A have been selected for the award.
- b) The prices offered by the bidders referred to in paragraph (a) are amounts of **N\$12,967,593.52** (Including VAT) for Lot 2, **N\$4,842,011.52** (Including VAT) for Lot 3 and **N\$5,079,472.12** (Including VAT) for Lot 4 respectively.
- c) The criteria used to select for the award of the bidders referred to in paragraph (a) is set out in the bidding document reference number: **NCS/ONB/CPBN-01/2020**.
- d) Kindly note that if you are not satisfied with the selection for the award made by the Central Procurement Board of Namibia (CPBN), you may make an application for the review of the selection made, with the CPBN within the seven (7) days of this notice, and in the absence of an application for review, the Accounting Officer of CPBN shall award the contract to the person (s) selected for the award.
- e) The standstill period of seven (7) days referred to in paragraph (d) starts on 29 July 2020 at 08H00 AM and ends on 04 August 2020 at 17H00 PM (Namibian Time).
- f) Any application for review referred to in paragraph (d), can be forwarded to the following electronic mail address: Reconsiderations@cpb.org.na



P. P. Swartz
Chairperson



Procuring with Integrity

+264 (61) 447 790 pr@cpb.org.na www.cpb.org.na P.O. Box 23650 Mandume Park, 1 Tenert Street, Windhoek, Namibia

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

Name of Procurement : RENDERING OF SECURITY AND FIDELITY TRANSITO SERVICES

CPBN Procurement Reference No : NCS/ONB/CPBN-01/2020

Date of Submission of Report : 25 June 2020

Contract Number : NCS/ONB/CPBN-01/2020

Scope of Contract : PROVISION OF SECURITY AND FIDELITY TRANSITO SERVICES TO THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE

1. **Estimated Cost:** N\$34,200,00.00
2. **Funding Agency:** Ministry of Finance
3. **Procurement Method Used:** Open National Bidding (Section 29 (a) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015)
4. **Date of Invitation of Bids:** 05 February 2019
5. **Closing Date of Submission of Bids:** 09 March 2020
6. **Date and Place of Opening of Bids:** 09 March 2020, Central Procurement Board of Namibia.
7. **Number of Bids Received by Closing Date:** TWENTY-FIVE (25)

8. RESPONSIVENESS OF BID(S):

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
1	Kangaru Trading Express CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder provided an ID copy of one shareholder that was not certified by the Commissioner of Oath as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1 Bidder did not provide good standing Tax certificate as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.3
3	Amon SN Investments CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bidder failed to provide certificates of code of conducts as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 Bidder did not provide proof of Registration with Namibian Police as a Bona-Fide Security Services Provider as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.8
5	Mukwe Security Service CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certificates of code of conduct provided by the bidder were not certified by the Commissioner of Oath as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito services insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
7	Extra Defense Protection Services CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of Namibian citizenship (ID) provided by the Bidder was not certified as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1 Bidder did not provide copies of affirmative action compliance certificate / proof from employment equity commissioner as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.5 No code of conduct was provided by the Bidder as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 Bidder provided a proof of firearm license for a different entity for mandatory evaluation criteria 1.9
8	Alert Security Services CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of Namibian Citizenship (ID) provided by the bidder was not certified as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1 Bidder provided expired proof from employment equity commissioner for mandatory evaluation criteria 1.2

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder Provided a self-made undertaking instead of filling in the undertaking form provided in the bidding document for mandatory evaluation criteria 1.6 • Bidder did not provide certificates of code of conduct as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 • Bidder did not provide firearm license as required in the mandatory evaluation criteria 1.9 • Bidder did not sign the bid securing declaration as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.11. • Bidding document not initialled by the Bidder as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.12
10	Ombala Security Services CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder failed to provide certificate of code of conduct as required in the mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7
11	Nkasa Security Services CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder failed to provide certificate of code of conduct as required in the mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 • Proof of Namibian Citizenship (ID) was not provided by the bidder as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1
12	Splash Investments CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder failed to provide certificate of code of conduct as required in the mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7 • Proof of Registration with Namibian Police as a Bona-Fide Security Services Provider was not provided by the bidder as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.8
13	Salambala Investment CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder did not provide the firearm license as per mandatory requirement criteria 1.9, instead bidder provided cover page of firearm identification book • Certificates of code of conduct by Namibian police provided by the bidder were not certified as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.7

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
19	Mpungu Security CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide certificate of code of conduct as per mandatory requirement 1.7 Bidder provided a Copy of Proof of Registration with Namibian Police as a Bona-Fide Security Services which was not certified as per mandatory requirement criteria 1.8 Firearm license provided by the bidder was not certified as required in the mandatory requirement criteria 1.9 Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
20	Tulikumo Investments CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good standing tax certificate provided by the bidder was not certified as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.3 Social Security good standing certificate provided by the bidder was not certified as required in the mandatory requirement criteria 1.4 Copy of proof from employment equity commissioner provided by the bidder was not certified as per the mandatory requirement criteria 1.5 Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
24	Africa Investment CC	Not responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide the proof of Namibian Citizenship (ID) as required in mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1
21	Shilmela Security and Debt Collection CC	Not Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide the certificates of code of conduct as per the mandatory requirement 1.7
22	Six Thousand Security Service CC	Not Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide the certificates of code of conduct as per the mandatory requirement 1.7
23	Chief Nangolo Security Service CC	Not Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide the certificates of code of conduct as per the mandatory requirement 1.7

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
14	Windhoek Security Services CC	Not Responsive and disqualified for: Fidelity/Transito Services	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
		Responsive for: Security Services	Not Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder failed to provide the Contract Manager's CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B Bidder failed to indicate the years of experience for the guards as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B Bidder failed to provide the declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 A Bidder failed to provide IDs of the top four (4) employees and provided only one (1) ID for technical evaluation criteria 2.3 B Bidder failed to provide CVs as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A Bidder failed to provide the title deed and lease agreement as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A Bidder failed to provide proof of the minimum required amount and the financial statement was outdated for 2.6 A Bidder provided an outdated letter from the External Accountant for technical evaluation criteria 2.6 B
15	Bertha Security Services CC	Not Responsive and disqualified for: Fidelity/Transito Services	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
		Responsive for: Security Services	Not Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder's company profile was not clearly explained as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 A



No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder failed to provide the Contract Manager's CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 • Bidder failed to indicate the experience of three (3) guards as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B • Bidder failed to provide declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 A • Bidder failed to provide two (2) certified copies of IDs of the guards and the declaration provided did not address the vetting as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 B • Bidder provided CV that failed to indicate who the Supervisors were, only one (1) guard met the required experience for technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A • Bidder failed to provide the lease agreement or title deed as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A
18	Mampi Security Services CC	Not Responsive and disqualified for: Fidelity/Transito Services	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder did not provide proof of Fidelity/Transito insurance as per mandatory evaluation criteria 1.10
		Responsive for: Security Services	Not Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder provided a company profile which was not clearly explained, lacking number of employees and operational geographic coverage. This was required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 A • Bidder failed to provide the Contract Manager's CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B (ii) • Bidder did not provide workplan as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 A • Bidder failed to provide Grade 10 certificates as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder failed to provide declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 A & B • Bidder failed to provide the security guard training as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 C • Bidder did not provide CVs and Grade 12 certificate and no experience was indicated as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A • Bidder failed to provide the lease agreement or title deed as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A • Bidder did not provide the picture of the identity cards to be used as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 B • Bidder provided the letter of intent which failed to indicate the required amount as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6 A • Bidder did not provide the letter from the Accountant or Auditor as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6. B
2	CIS Security Services CC	Yes	Not responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder's workplan lacks substantial methodology as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 A • Bidder did not provide grade 10 certificates and CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B • Bidder did not provide declarations as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 A: i & ii & 2.3 B • Bidder did not provide security guard training program as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 C • Bidder did not provide CV and grade 12 certificate and no experience was indicated as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A • Bidder failed to provide the Supervisory CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 B • Bidder failed to provide the lease agreement or title deed as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A • Bidder failed to provide a picture of the identity cards to be used as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 B

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder only provided one reference with less than 5 years of experience (18 months) for technical evaluation criteria 2.1B • Bidder failed to provide 2 contactable references for technical evaluation criteria 2.1 C: ii • Bidder failed to provide CV, Grade 10 certificates and Drivers licenses as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B: iii • Bidder failed to provide intent to acquire a short-term insurance to the value of N\$10,000,000.00 as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6 C



No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
6	Jupiter Security CC	Yes	Not responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder's company profile was not clearly explained as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 A Bidder's work plan lacks substantial working methodology as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 A Bidder provided 5 CVs with required experience however only 2 CVs had grade 10 certificates attached as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B Bidder failed to provide the declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3.A: I & II and 2.3 B Bidder failed to provide the training program as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 C Bidder failed to provide the lease agreement or title deed as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A Bidder failed to provide the Identity card as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 B Bidder did not provide the CV of the Contract Manager and bidder had no required experience as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B: II Bidder failed to provide reference as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 C: II Bidder failed to provide the proof of Insurance to the required amount as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6 C
9	Ombandje Security Services CC	Yes	Not responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder provided a company profile lacking number of employees for technical evaluation criteria 2.1 A Bidder failed to provide the CV of the Contract Manager as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B

No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder provided only one contactable reference. Other References provided were not current as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 C • Bidder failed to provide CVs and grade 10 certificates as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B • Bidder had no transitio service experience and failed to provide CV as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B: II. • Bidder did not provide declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 a: I & II and 2.3 B • Bidder failed to provide security guard training program as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 C • Bidder did not provide CV and Grade 12 certificates and no experience was indicated as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A • Bidder failed to provide lease agreement or title deed as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 A • Bidder failed to provide pictures of badges as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.5 B • Bidder has no transitio service experience and CV was not provided as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 B: II • Bidder failed to provide three (3) contactable reference as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.1 C: ii • Bidder failed to provide CVs and certified copies of grade 10 certificates as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B: III • Bidder failed to provide proof of insurance worth N\$10 as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6 C
25	Shikuvule Trading CC	Yes	Not Responsive and Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder provided CVs of guards as required however no grade 10 certificates were attached. Guards did not meet the required experience; no training certificates were provided for the guards as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.2 B (i).



No	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per evaluation stage			Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Experience	Financial Evaluation	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder failed to provide the declaration as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.3 A I & B Out of 3 guard's CVs provided by the Bidder, one (1) guard did not meet the 3 years required experience as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.4 A Bidder did not meet the required amount as required in technical evaluation criteria 2.6 A
17	Omle Security Services CC	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified
16	Royal Security Services CC	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified
4	Omeya Investment CC	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified

9. PRICE COMPARISON FOR THE RESPONSIVE BID(S):

A) LOT 2

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	Omeya Investment CC	N\$487,563.66 (per month)	None	None	3
16	Royal Security Services CC	N\$12,967,593.52 (3 years)	None	None	1
17	Omle Security Services CC	N\$480,762.00 (per month)	None	None	2

B) LOT 3

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	Omeya Investment CC	N\$134,500.32 (per month)	None	None	2
16	Royal Security Services CC	N\$3,059,634.97 (3 years)	None	None	1

C) LOT 4

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	Omeya Investment CC	N\$224,167.20 (per month)	None	None	3
16	Royal Security Services CC	N\$5,079,472.12 (3 years)	None	None	1
17	Omle Security Services CC	N\$223,200.00 (per month)	None	None	2



10. BEST EVALUATED BID(S): LOT 2

Proposed Award of Contract:

Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder: (Lot 2)

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

Name: Royal Security Services CC

Description	Currency	Royal Security Services CC Amount (including VAT)
Bid Price	N\$	
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	N\$12,967,593.52 (3 years)
Corrections of Errors	N\$	None
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	N\$12,967,593.52 (3 years)

11. BEST EVALUATED BID(S) LOT 3

Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder (Lot 3):

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

Name: Omeya Investment CC

Description	Currency	Omeya Investment CC
Bid Price	N\$	Amount (including VAT)
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	N\$134,500.32 (per month)
Corrections of Errors	N\$	None
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	N\$4,842,011.52 (3 years)



12. BEST EVALUATED BID(S) LOT 4


Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder (Lot 4):

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

Name: Royal Security Services CC

Description	Currency	Royal Security Services CC Amount (including VAT)
Bid Price	N\$	
Bid Price(s) Read-Out	N\$	N\$5,079,472.12 (3 years)
Corrections of Errors	N\$	None
Discounts	N\$	None
Proposed Award	N\$	N\$5,079,472.12 (3 years)

According to instruction to bidders on page 55 of the Standard Bidding Document, (a bidder can only be awarded two (2) Lots maximum) hence Royal Security Services was only awarded Lot 2 & Lot 4 as the lowest bidder and Lot 3 was awarded to Omeya Investments CC as the second lowest bidder.


P.F. Swartz
 Chairperson