

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
82	Dago Island Investments (Pty) Ltd	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Functional organizational structure for managing the contract as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(6) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28. The bidder did not submit declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28. The 100% Namibian ownership and 51% ownership by previously disadvantaged Namibians could not be confirmed because the Bidder did not submit the required supporting documents to determine the ultimate beneficial owners. No Identity Documents were provided for one of the shareholders as required in ITB 36.3(d) and clarification 14. Bidder submitted Good Standing Social Security Certificate dated 25 June 2020 that is not valid as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
83	Napandue Investments Cc	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
86	Oases General Dealer Cc	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit the Bid Securing Declaration in accordance with ITB Clause 22 (JV partners to submit the same) as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(1) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 27. Bidder submitted Good Standing Social Security Certificate dated 08 July 2020 that is not valid as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11. Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
89	Undera Investments Cc; Hockland Farms JV	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not meet the 51% ownership by previously disadvantaged Namibians as required in ITB 36.3(d) and clarification 14. Bidder did not submit for service provisions in regions North of the Veterinary Cordon Fence (NVCF) / Northern Communal Areas (NCAs), bidders are required to furnish letters of intent for the supply or sourcing of fresh produce, meat and other products from local producers or suppliers north of the cordon fence. For this purpose, all Bidders should obtain supply agreements or letters of intent with registered fresh produce producers or Meat Board Registered Abattoirs (in case of meat) in those regions, as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28. Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
90	Evale Holdings (Pty) Ltd	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
91	Gongaleni Investment Cc	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit letters of intent for the supply or sourcing of fresh produce, meat and other products from local producers or suppliers north of the cordon fence. For this purpose, all Bidders should obtain supply agreements or letters of intent with registered fresh produce producers or Meat Board Registered Abattoirs (in case of meat) in those regions, as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
92	Omaungungu Caterers Cc; Thomas Nghivalwa Ehafo Stores Cc JV	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 100% Namibian ownership and 51% ownership by previously disadvantaged Namibians could not be confirmed because the Bidder did not submit the required supporting documents to determine the ultimate beneficial owners. No Identity Documents were provided for the shareholders as required in ITB 36.3(d) and clarification 14.
93	Atlantic Catering Solutions (Pty) Ltd	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 100% Namibian ownership and 51% ownership by previously disadvantaged Namibians could not be confirmed because the Bidder did not submit the required supporting documents to determine the ultimate beneficial owners of Kampegere Womens Group ACS Community Trust as required in ITB 36.3(d) and clarification 14. Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
94	ETA Investments Cc; ETN Technical Services Cc; Sunshine Foods Services Cc JV	Non- Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Certified copies of full company registration documents for Sunshine Foods Services Cc to prove full ownership / share structure of all bidders and for Joint Ventures, as per the JV requirements in terms of ITB 12.1 (b) and ITB 12.1 (c) (formal intent to enter into agreement or existing agreement shall be submitted, as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(1) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11. Bidder did not submit Certified copies of valid company Registration Certificate for Sunshine Foods Services Cc (for JVs each JV Partner to comply), as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(2) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11. Bidder submitted Good Standing Social Security Certificate dated 24 June 2020 for ETA Investments Cc; 15 July 2020 for ETN Technical Services Cc and 16 July 2020 for Sunshine Foods Services Cc that is not valid as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(4) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11. Bidder did not submit a valid certified copy of Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate, or proof from Employment Equity Commissioner that bidder is not a relevant employer, or exemption issued in terms of Section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998 for ETA Investments Cc;

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
						<p>as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(5) in the Instruction to Bidders of the bidding document on page 11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms for ETA Investments Cc and ETN Technical Services Cc as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
96	DeRoute Investments Cc	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Declaration that the bidders' shareholders have no interest in other Bidders' firms as required in ITB 12.1 (h)(7) in the Bidding Data Sheet of the bidding document on page 28.
5	STS Mega Investment Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STS Mega Investment Cc, Primary menu costing as per pricing schedule for Lot: B was N\$ 1,193,307.15 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Secondary menu costing was N\$ 2,806,718.86 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. On average the bidder scored 0 point of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Overall score for phase 2: 60 out of 100 available points.



#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
12	Optimus Namib Trading Cc; Penda Trading and Consultancy Cc JV	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Optimus Namib Trading Cc, Penda Trading and Consultancy Cc JV Investments does not comply with ITB 36.3(a) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No menu costing was provided by the bidder as per bidding document. Resulting in a bidder scoring zero out of available 30 points. Optimus Namib Trading Cc, Penda Trading and Consultancy Cc JV Investments Primary menu as per pricing schedule for Lot: B,D,F provided by the bidder was N\$30.14 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 30 points. Secondary menu costing as per pricing schedule was N\$30.14 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 10 points. On average the bidder scored 20 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet.
14	Ekwakuti Trading Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall score for phase 2: 50 out of 100 available points. Ekwakuti Trading Cc does not comply with ITB 36.3(d) for the following reasons: No Secondary menu costing was provided by the bidder, resulting in a scoring of zero out of 30 available points. Ekwakuti Trading Cc Primary menu as per pricing schedule for Lot: G provided by the bidder was N\$44.79 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
						<p>scoring 5 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$44.79 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. On average the bidder scored 12.5 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall score for phase 2: 42.5 out of 100 available points.
16	Katiki Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katiki Trading Cc Primary menu costing for Lot: H was N\$44.67 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 5 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$62.03 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. On average the bidder scored 5 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet.
25	Kambwa Trading Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall score for phase 2: 62.50 out of 100 available points. • Kambwa Trading Cc Primary menu costing Lot: G was N\$45.53 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$56.45 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. On average the bidder scored 0 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Lot: H was N\$41.53 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 10 points. Secondary menu was N\$56.65 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. On average the bidder scored 5 points of

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
						<p>available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet for Lot: H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall score for phase 2: 65 out of 100 available points.
37	Igloo Investment Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Igloo Investment Cc does not comply with ITB 36.3(d) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bidder did not add up the menu costing per week and for the full 21-day cycle. The bidder provided a summary of pricing that is not based on the menu costing which is contrary to the ITB 36.3(d). Igloo Investment Cc Primary menu costing for Lot: B Primary menu costing was N\$12,297.79 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Secondary menu costing was N\$12,304.22 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. On average the bidder scored 0 points. Lot: C Primary menu costing was N\$12,464.46 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Secondary menu costing was N\$12,470.89 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Lot: E Primary menu costing was N\$12,664.4 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Secondary menu costing was N\$12,670.89 versus a

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
40	New Success Investments Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. On average the bidder scored 0 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall score for phase 2: 45 out of 100 available points. <p>New Success Investments Cc does not comply with ITB 36.3(d) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No costed menu was provided by the bidder, resulting in a scoring of zero out of 30 available points. New Success Investments Cc Primary menu as per pricing schedule provided for Lot: G was N\$39.75 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. Secondary menu was N\$36.95 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 40 points. On average the bidder scored 30 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Overall score for phase 2: 60 out of 100 available points.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
52	Kenzi Investments Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Kenzi Investments Cc does not comply with ITB 36.3(d) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No costed menu was provided by the bidder, resulting in a scoring of zero out of 30 available points. Kenzi Investments Cc Primary menu costing pricing as per pricing schedule provided for Lot: A was N\$40.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$46.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. On average the bidder scored 20 points. Lot: B Primary menu costing was N\$40.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$46.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. On average the bidder scored 20 points. Lot F Primary menu costing was N\$40.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$46.00 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 20 points. On average the bidder scored per lot the following points. On average the bidder scored 20 points.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall score for phase 2: per LOT: Lot A: 60, Lot: B 45, Lot: F 50 out of 100 available points.
54	Homestead Academy Production-Hub Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homestead Academy Production-Hub Cc Primary menu costing for Lot: H was N\$21.95 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$41.31 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 10 points. On average the bidder scored 5 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Overall score for phase 2: 65 out of 100 available points.
87	Silver Spoon Trading Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Silver Spoon Trading Cc Primary menu costing for Lot: H was N\$86.97 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. Secondary menu costing was N\$3,466,685.17 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 0 point. On average the bidder scored 0 point of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Overall score for phase 2: 60 out of 100 available points.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
95	Pena Manufactures Cc	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<p>Pena Manufactures Cc does not comply with ITB 36.3(d) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No costed menu was provided by the bidder, resulting in a scoring of zero out of 30 available points. Pena Manufactures Cc Primary menu costing as per price schedule submitted was N\$39.05 versus a benchmarking price of N\$34.35, resulting in the bidder scoring 30 points. Secondary menu costing was N\$45.65 versus a benchmarking price of N\$39.06, resulting in the bidder scoring 10 points. On average the bidder scored 20 points of available possible 40 points as per the evaluation sheet. Overall score for phase 2: 50 out of 100 available points.
28	BN Multinational Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 51 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.
42	Magnetize Investment Cc; Wulika Investments Cc JV	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 65 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
47	Uptown Windhoek Investments	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 52 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.
76	Penda Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 62 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.
84	Tafina Trading Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 66 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.
85	Pamo Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 52 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.
88	Patriot General Services (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Non-Responsive and disqualified	Not-Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder scored 46 points at the Post Qualification Technical Evaluation and did not meet the minimum score of 70 points.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
3	James & Young Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.
33	Beva Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.
38	Sash Trading and Earthworks Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.
41	Ndakalimwe Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.
43	Tuthikameni Pamwe Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.
44	Future Fresh Super Market Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder not disqualified.

#	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness per evaluation stage				Reasons Why Bid Is Not Responsive
		Phase 1: Compulsory Disclosure (Eligibility) Evaluation	Phase 2: Financial Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.1 Technical Evaluation	Phase 3: 3.2: Site Inspection	
56	Om'kwana Caterer Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder not disqualified.
64	Fundamental Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder not disqualified.
62	Stream Two Properties Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder not disqualified.



9. PRICE COMPARISON FOR RESPONSIVE BIDS

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Allocated	Man -Day Price (Bid Opening) before arithmetical error correction (Vat inclusive)	Man -Day Price after arithmetical error correction (Vat Incusive)
3	James & Young Trading Enterprises Cc	A - Omaheke	Primary N\$29.43 & Secondary N\$34.74	Primary N\$36.20 & Secondary N\$42.73
33	Beva Investments Cc	F - Otjozondjupa	Primary N\$35.35 & Secondary N\$40.99	Primary N\$35.34 & Secondary N\$41.01
38	Sash Trading and Earthworks Cc	I – Oshana and Oshikoto	Primary N\$34.94 & Secondary N\$39.84	Primary N\$36.79 & Secondary N\$41.74
41	Ndakalimwe Investments Cc	H - Ohangwena	Primary N\$34.83 & Secondary N\$40.26	Primary N\$34.83 & Secondary N\$40.26
43	Tuthikameni Pamwe Investments Cc	D - Erongo and Kunene	Primary N\$27.50 & Secondary N\$35.03	Primary N\$36.95 & Secondary N\$45.05
44	Future Fresh Super Market Cc	B - Khomas	Primary N\$30.83 & Secondary N\$37.15	Primary N\$34.86 & Secondary N\$41.76
56	Om'kwana Caterer Cc	G - Omusati	Primary N\$34.52 & Secondary N\$41.69	Primary N\$34.53 & Secondary N\$42.01
62	Stream Two Properties Cc	E – Zambezi and Kavango East and West	Primary N\$36.27 & Secondary N\$42.06	Primary N\$37.25 & Secondary N\$43.25
64	Fundamental Trading Enterprises Cc	C- Hardap and Karas	Primary N\$31.00 & Secondary N\$34.95	Primary N\$30.81 & Secondary N\$34.91

10. Lowest Substantially Responsive Bids taking into account the following factors:

- a. Bidder bid for that particular Lot.
- b. Base and operate as per Ministry of Finance directive and as per bidding document.
- c. Only one bidder per lot allocated.

Proposed Award of Contract

The board resolve to approve as per the recommendation of the Bid Evaluation Committee in line with Section 9 (1) (k) and I (i) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015.

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name & Address	Lot Allocated	Man -Day Price (Bid Opening) arithmetical correction (Vat inclusive) before error	Man -Day Price after arithmetical error correction (Vat Incusive)
3	James & Young Trading Enterprises Cc Unit 14, Brahman street, Northern Industry, Windhoek	A - Omaheke	Primary N\$29.43 & Secondary N\$34.74	Primary N\$36.20 & Secondary N\$42.73
33	Beva Investments Cc P O BOX 1162 Oshakati	F - Otjozondjupa	Primary N\$35.35 & Secondary N\$40.99	Primary N\$35.34 & Secondary N\$41.01
38	Sash Trading and Earthworks Cc	I - Oshana and Oshikoto	Primary N\$34.94 & Secondary N\$39.84	Primary N\$36.79 & Secondary N\$41.74
41	Ndakalimwe Investments Cc Erf 5854, corner of Dr Kuaima Riruako and Pasteur street Windhoek West	H - Ohangwena	Primary N\$34.83 & Secondary N\$40.26	Primary N\$34.83 & Secondary N\$40.26
43	Tuthikameni Pamwe Investments Cc 15 Promenaden Road Eros, Windhoek	D - Erongo and Kunene	Primary N\$27.50 & Secondary N\$35.03	Primary N\$36.95 & Secondary N\$45.05
44	Future Fresh Super Market Cc 31, Andimba Toivo Ya Toivo, Windhoek	B - Khomas	Primary N\$30.83 & Secondary N\$37.15	Primary N\$34.86 & Secondary N\$41.76
56	Om'kwana Caterer Cc Onethindi, Ondangwa Main Road	G - Omusati	Primary N\$34.52 & Secondary N\$41.69	Primary N\$34.53 & Secondary N\$42.01
62	Stream Two Properties Cc Erf 2902, Main Road Omuthiya	E - Zambezi and Kavango East and West	Primary N\$36.27 & Secondary N\$42.06	Primary N\$37.25 & Secondary N\$43.25
64	Fundamental Trading Enterprises Cc Unit 18, Nachtigal Street, Windhoek	C- Hardap and Karas	Primary N\$31.00 & Secondary N\$34.95	Primary N\$30.81 & Secondary N\$34.91

Subject to the following Conditions:

- **Tuthikameni Pamwe Investments CC** obtaining a suitable warehouse within thirty (30) days of the notice of procurement award to the satisfaction of the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) as stated in the standard bidding document; and
- **Fundamental Trading Enterprises CC** obtaining a suitable warehouse within thirty (30) days of the notice of procurement award to the satisfaction of the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) as stated in the standard bidding document.

19 February 2021



P.P. Swartz
Chairperson