

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

1.	Name of Procurement	Procurement of Provision of Security Services to the Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare Premises in Khomas, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana, Oshikoto, Kavango East, Kavango West, Otjozondjupa, Zambezi, Erongo, Kunene, Omaheke, Hardap and Karas Regions for 36 Months
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2022
3.	Date of Submission of Report	22 June 2022
4.	Contract Number	NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2022
5.	Scope of Contract	Procurement of Provision of Security Services to the Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare Premises in Khomas, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana, Oshikoto, Kavango East, Kavango West, Otjozondjupa, Zambezi, Erongo, Kunene, Omaheke, Hardap and Karas Regions for 36 Months
6.	Estimated Cost:	N\$ 25,060,000.00 (Inc. VAT)
7.	Funding Agency	Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare
8.	Procurement Method Used	Open Advertised Bidding (NCS)
9.	Date of Invitation of Bids	29 April 2022
10.	Closing Date of Submission of Bids	09 June 2022
11.	Date and Place of Opening of Bids	09 June 2022, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	Number of Bids Received by Closing Date	Forty-Five (45)

13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
5	Royal Security Family Investment Cc	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not initial page 50 of the bidding document as per ITB 19.2.
30	Namibia Peoples Protection Services Cc	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not initial page 5 of the bidding document as per ITB 19.2.
32	Zeni Investment Cc	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not initial page i and ii of the bidding document as per ITB 19.2.
42	Ombandje Security Services Cc	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit page 66, 67, 68 and 69 of the bidding document, hence not all pages of the bid were signed and/or initialed as per ITB 19.2.
43	Ombala Security Services Cc	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not initial page 77 of the bidding document as per ITB 19.2.
1	Bertha Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs of which one of the CVs does not meet the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
2	Nebby Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs. However, none of the security guards' CVs indicated Security Training. Only three security guard's CVs indicated at least two years security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	7. Financial Evaluation	
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement		
4	Onamagongwa Trading Enterprise Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 4 different security guards' CVs of which two of the CVs do not meet the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
6	Kaviombo Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide proof of previous experience by key personnel (Contract Manager and Security Supervisor in security sector (s) as per ITB 5.3 (i) of the bidding document. Bidder submitted 6 different security guards' CVs of which two of the CVs do not meet the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
7	Group Two Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder only submitted one security guard CV with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
8	Eass Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs of which one of the CVs does not meet the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
10	Shikuvule Trading Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs with at least two (2) years' security guard experience. However, none of the security guards' CVs indicated Security Training as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
11	Mukwe Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs of which three of the CVs did not indicate the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
13	FBH Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit a Certificate of Registration as a Bona-fide Security Service Provider with NAMPOL as per ITB 5.3 (iv) of the bidding document. Bidder did not provide a public Liability Insurance Cover letter or letter of intent for insurance cover worth N\$2 Million per lot, from any legally registered Financial Institution as per ITB 5.3 (vi) of the bidding document. Bidder did not provide proof of previous experience by key personnel (Contract Manager and Security Supervisor in security sector (s) as per ITB 5.3 (i) of the bidding document. Bidder submitted 2 different security guards' CVs of which none of the CVs have Security Training and at least 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
14	Tuli Kumo Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs of which none of the CVs have Security Training and four of the CVs did not indicate the 2 years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
18	Omatungo Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs without Security Training contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
21	Eli Tjisola Trading Security Services	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 3 different security guards' CVs with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
23	Bondel Swartz Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 3 different security guards' CVs with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
25	Black and White Security Services	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Namibian Identity Documents (IDs) of shareholdings of owners as per ITB 13.1 (f) 1 of the bidding document. Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs with at least two (2) years' security guard experience. However, four (4) of the security guards' CVs did not indicate Security Training as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
28	African King Security Services	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 2 different security guards' CVs with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
29	Windhoek Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs with at least two (2) years' security guard experience. However, none of the security guards' CVs indicated Security Training as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
34	Tanhwe Security Force Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 6 different security guards' CVs of which one of the CVs have Security Training and 2 years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
35	Amon SN Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide a public Liability Insurance Cover letter or letter of intent for insurance cover worth N\$2 Million per lot, from any legally registered Financial Institution as per ITB 5.3 (vi) of the bidding document.
38	Josse and Dely Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not provide Fitness Certificates from Municipalities or Town Councils, title deed or lease agreement in any region for lot that the bidder bid for to confirm the location where the bidder operates from as per ITB 5.3 (ii) of the bidding document. Bidder did not provide a public Liability Insurance Cover letter or letter of intent for insurance cover worth N\$2 Million per lot, from any legally registered

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
									<p>Financial Institution as per ITB 5.3 (vi) of the bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit at least five (5) different security guards' CVs with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
44	Omeya Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted 5 different security guards' CVs with at least two (2) years' security guard experience. However, three (3) of the security guards' CVs did not indicate Security Training as per ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
45	Amutanga Trading Enterprises Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder submitted only 3 different security guards' CVs with Security Training and with at least two (2) years' security guard experience contrary to ITB 5.3 (viii) of the bidding document.
22	Torra Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not obtain 70% or more as required on page 38 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 66.04 points out of 100.
24	Extra Defense Protection Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not obtain 70% or more as required on page 38 of the bidding document. The bidder scored 58.02 points out of 100.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
3	Xiphos Protection Group Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
9	Omle Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot for or provide proof of such amount in the bank in the form of bank statements as per ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
26	Ngatukondje Trading Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee and a bank rating contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
31	Kimpert Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot for. Bidder only provided

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation	
									a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee and a bank rating contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
33	Omambudu Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot bid for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
40	Total Protection Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot bid for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee and a bank rating contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.
41	Baobab Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None-Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot bid for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for 10% performance guarantee contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages										Reasons why Bidder was not responsive
		Stage 1					Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4			
		1. Eligibility Evaluation	2. Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	3. Conflict of Interest	4. Mandatory Requirements Document Evaluation Criteria	5. Technical Evaluation	6. Financial Requirement	7. Financial Evaluation				
36	Independent Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	None- Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit Letter of intent from any registered financial institution to the value of three (3) months working capital of the bid price of the lot bid for. Bidder only provided a letter of intent for performance guarantee contrary to ITB 5.5 (e) of the bidding document. 			
12	Chief Mangolo Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
15	Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
16	Six Thousand Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
17	Rubicon Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
19	Sirka Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
20	Neilto Shine Investment Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
27	Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
37	Triple One Investments Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			
39	PIS Security Services Cc	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not disqualified.			

14. Price Comparison for the Responsive Bid(s)

As provided for in Section 52 (12), of the Public Procurement Act, 15 of 2015 (PPA) the Bid Evaluation Committee examined and verified the nine (9) responsive bids to ascertain whether there are any errors in computation and summation.

Lot	Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Bid Price After Corrections (N\$)	Price After Margin of Preference (if applicable) N\$	Ranking	Recommended/ Alternative
Lot 1	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	4,639,491.00	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	4,801,032.00	None	None	2	Recommended
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	4,821,120.00	None	None	3	
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	4,901,472.00	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	5,142,528.00	None	None	5	
	Bidder No 37: Triple One Investments Cc	5,323,320.00	None	None	6	
	Bidder No 27: Shine Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	6,187,104.00	None	None	7	
Lot 2	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	3,711,592.80	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	3,856,896.00	None	None	2	Recommended
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	3,889,036.80	None	None	3	
	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	3,953,318.40	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	4,114,022.40	None	None	5	
	Bidder No 37: Triple One Investments Cc	4,146,163.20	None	None	6	
	Bidder No 27: Shine Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	4,949,683.20	None	None	7	
	Bidder No 17: Rubicon Security Services Cc	5,539,038.34	None	None	8	
Lot 3	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	4,841,208.00	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	4,892,544.00	None	None	2	Recommended
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	4,971,110.40	None	None	3	
	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	5,035,392.00	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	5,485,363.20	None	None	5	
	Bidder No 37: Triple One Investments Cc	6,106,752.00	None	None	6	
	Bidder No 27: Shine Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	6,856,704.00	None	None	7	
Lot 4	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	3,933,481.50	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	4,387,219.20	None	None	2	
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	4,422,038.40	None	None	3	
	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	4,456,857.60	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	4,456,857.60	None	None	5	

Lot	Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Bid Price After Corrections (N\$)	Price After Margin of Preference (if applicable) N\$	Ranking	Recommended/ Alternative
	Bidder No 37: Triple One Investments Cc	4,787,640.00	None	None	6	Recommended
	Bidder No 27: Shine Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	5,571,072.00	None	None	7	
	Bidder No 17: Rubicon Security Services Cc	6,000,624.86	None	None	8	
Lot 5	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	5,228,236.80	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	5,271,091.20	None	None	2	
	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	5,293,054.08	None	None	3	Recommended
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	5,313,945.60	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	5,485,363.20	None	None	5	
	Bidder No 37: Triple One Investments Cc	5,785,344.00	None	None	6	
	Bidder No 19: Sirka Investment Cc	6,428,160.00	None	None	7	
	Bidder No 27: Shine Technologies Solutions (PTY) Ltd	6,428,160.00	None	None	8	
	Bidder No 17: Rubicon Security Services Cc	9,326,299.50	None	None	9	
	Lot 6	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	2,571,264.00	None	None	1
Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc		2,592,691.20	None	None	2	
Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc		2,603,404.80	3,348,000.00	None	3	
Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc		2,721,834.72	None	None	4	
Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc		2,742,681.06	None	None	5	Recommended
Lot 7	Bidder No 20: Nelito Investment Cc	3,119,889.60	None	None	1	Alternate
	Bidder No 12: Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	3,321,216.00	None	None	2	
	Bidder No 16: Six Thousand Security Services Cc	3,348,000.00	2,603,404.80	None	3	
	Bidder No 15: Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	3,374,784.00	None	None	4	
	Bidder No 39: PIS Security Services Cc	3,428,352.00	None	None	5	
	Bidder No 19: Sirka Investment Cc	3,883,680.00	None	None	6	Recommended

**15. Best Evaluated Bid(s) Selected For Award of Contract:
Best Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidders.**

Given recommendation(s) in the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) report, The Board approved in terms of Section 9 (1) (k) and (l) (i) and Section 55 (6) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 as follows:

Bidder No.	Bidder's Name	Lot Allocated	Bid Price(s) Read-Out	Corrections of Errors	Discounts	Proposed Award	Address
15	Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services	1	N\$4,801,032.00	None	None	N\$4,801,032.00	P.O BOX 4166 Ondangwa
16	Six Thousand Security Services Cc	2	N\$3,856,896.00	None	None	N\$3,856,896.00	P.O. BOX 3855 Ondangwa
12	Chief Nangolo Security Services Cc	3	N\$4,892,544.00	None	None	N\$4,892,544.00	P.O. BOX 530 Ondangwa
37	Triple One Investments Cc	4	N\$4,787,640.00	None	None	N\$4,787,640.00	P.O. BOX 15325 Oshakati
20	Nelito Investment Cc	5	N\$5,293,054.08	None	None	N\$5,293,054.08	P.O. BOX 22971 Windhoek
39	PIS Security Services Cc	6	N\$2,742,681.06	None	None	N\$2,742,681.06	P.O. BOX 63090 Katutura Windhoek
19	Sirka Investment Cc	7	N\$3,883,680.00	None	None	N\$3,883,680.00	P.O. BOX 25376 Independence Windhoek

25 July 2022


A. Ngavetene
Chairperson



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM

**PROCUREMENT OF PROVISION OF SECURITY SERVICES TO THE MINISTRY OF GENDER EQUALITY, POVERTY ERADICATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE PREMISES IN KHOMAS, OHANGWENA, OMUSATI, OSHANA, OSHIKOTO, KAVANGO EAST, KAVANGO WEST, OTJOZONDJUPA, ZAMBEZI, ERONGO, KUNENE, OMAHEKE, HARDAP AND KARAS REGIONS FOR 36 MONTHS
(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. NCS/OAB/CPBN-03/2022)**

I/We _____ hereby
acknowledge receipt of this Executive Summary _____ and undertake to
immediately return the signed acknowledgment of receipt to CPBN as proof of receipt.

Name: Signature:

Date: Company Stamp: