



**Environmental Investment Fund
of Namibia** | ensuring sustainability

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION
REPORT**

FOR

**SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF IRRIGATION SYSTEM AT FRANSPONTEIN
COMMUNITY GARDENS IN KUNENE REGION**

**Environmental Investment Fund of Namibia (EIF),
P O Box 28157,
Auas Valley,
Windhoek,
Tel: +264 61 431 7700,**

**Physical Address: 8933 Heinizburg Heights,
c/o Heinizburg & Dr. Theo Ben-Gurirab Streets,
Klein Windhoek,
Windhoek, Namibia**

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Project Title

Reference number of procurement

1. **Scope of Contract:** Supply and Installation of Irrigation System at Fransfontein Community Gardens in Kunene Region
2. **Procurement method used:** Open National Bidding
3. **Closing date for submission of bids:** 14 October 2020
4. **Date and place of opening of bids:** 14 October 2020, EIF
5. **Number of bids received by closing date:** 14
6. **Responsiveness of bids**

Bidder' s Name	Bid Price N\$	Responsive or not responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
Omhangela Construction	10 219 654.17	Yes	
Oihole Engineering Services	5 771 099.89	No	Fail technical evaluation (Scored 40%)
Nauseb Trading Enterprises	12 814 097.14	No	a)Submitted a copy of a Good Standing Tax Certificate that is not original.
One Stone Investments	12 130 248.81	Yes	
Nirwana Trading Enterprises JV YMX Trading Enterprises	12 603 946.46	Yes	
Betonstein Construction	13 369 520.60	Yes	
Green Park Irrigation & Maintenance	8 003 262.80	No	a) Submitted a Good Standing Tax Certificate for Andreas Ulrich von Schrip but not for Green Park Investment. b) Submitted Certificate of Defensive name instead of the company registration certificate as per ITB 13.1 (f) (i).
AR Geiseb Civil Engineering	6 092 554.99	Yes	
CAT Trading Enterprises	11 355 453 19	No	Fail technical evaluation (Scored 56%)
Revenue Investment	10 840 793.21	No	Fail technical evaluation (Scored 54%)
Shafa Trading Enterprises	9 882 180.00	No	Fail technical evaluation (Scored 66%)
Oshali Community Garden JV Ndakalimwe Investment	4 004 351.18	No	Fail technical evaluation (Scored 54%)

Omwigo Trading JV Amiran 2 Limited (JV)	8 376 044.21	No	a) The JV partner Amiran 2 Limited's good standing for Tax Certificate and for Social Security is not registered in Namibia, Amiran is a foreign company, registered in Zambia.
NATWE Engineering Services	6 382 288.05	Yes	

7. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive:

Name	A. Bid Price N\$	B. Bid Price after corrections	C. price after Adjustments N\$	D. Percentage of Price Below the construction estimate (under quote)
Construction estimate	12 520 345.05			
1. Omangela Construction	10 219 654.17	N/A	N/A	10%
2. One Stone Investments	12 130 248.81	N/A	N/A	
3. Nirwana trading Enterprises JV YMX Trading Enterprises	12 603 946.46	N/A	N/A	
4. Betonstein Construction	13 369 520.60	N/A	N/A	
5. AR Geiseb Civil Engineering	6 092 554.99	N/A	N/A	10%
6. NATWE Engineering Services	6 382 288.05	N/A	N/A	10%

8. Best Evaluated Bid: **One Stone Investments cc**

Section IV - Evaluation Criteria

This section contains supplementary criteria that the Employer shall use to evaluate bids.

The Employer reserves the right to check the information provided by the bidders. In the event that the bidder supplied wrong information, the Employer reserves the right to reject the bid.

1. Evaluation Methodology

In addition to the criteria listed in ITB32 and ITB 33, the following criteria shall apply:

a) Open National Bidding

This bid is in terms of the National Bidding Procurement Act and in terms of Clause 29 is limited to the following entities:

1. Namibian citizens
2. Entities incorporated in Namibia with no less than 51 percent equity owned by Namibian citizens of which no less than 30% is owned by previously disadvantaged persons.

b) Range of Bid

Bids that fall within a range of 10% below or 10% above the estimated construction cost, including provisional sums, contingencies, escalation and VAT, will be adjudicated.

c) Adequacy of Technical Proposal

Evaluation of the Bidder's Technical Proposal will include an assessment of the Bidder's technical capacity to mobilize key equipment and personnel for the contract consistent with its proposal regarding work methods, scheduling, and material sourcing in sufficient detail and fully in accordance with the requirements stipulated in Section V (Employer's Requirements).

d) Multiple Contracts

Pursuant to sub-clause ITB 1.1: If Works are grouped in multiple contracts or Contract Areas, evaluation will be carried out as follows:

Not applicable (N/A) to this Contract.

e) Completion Time

An alternative Completion Time is not permitted under ITB 15.1 will be evaluated as follows:

Evaluation will be based on the programme of works provided and proposed execution methodology and Evaluation will be to the benefit of the project but not compromising on the project specifications and quality. The maximum intended completion period is **9 months** from the Contract commencement date.

f) Technical Alternatives

Technical alternatives are not permitted under ITB 15.1, will be evaluated as follows:

Evaluation of alternative proposal will be based on the following:

- (i) Viability of the technical methods and material specified as alternative;
- (ii) Benefits and economical values of the alternative proposal to the project, end-users and the Employer;
- (iii) SANS compliance with all required certification and accreditation of the alternative and
- (iv) Cost and savings detailed analysis of the alternative

g) Margin of Preference

A Margin of Preference shall be applied to all Bidders in terms of Sub-Clause ITB 32.1 of the BDS as follows:

Not applicable (N/A) for this Contract

2. A Technical Score

Is determined for each Bidder according to pre-determined Evaluation Criteria, including criteria for ‘Targeted Procurement’ as defined in (e) and (f) below.

3. A Price Score

Is determined for each Bidder with respect to each Contract Area.

4. A Bidder Index

Is calculated for each Bidder with respect to each Contract Area.

5. Evaluation Criteria

In addition to the mandatory documents listed under ITB 13 and the evaluation Criteria listed and defined under Section IV, the following evaluation criteria shall apply:

The Bids will be evaluated according to the following Evaluation Criteria, which assign merit points to attributes relating to price and non-price factors. In this way a **Bid Index** is determined for each Bidder with respect to each Contract Area as described in (6) below.

6. Calculation of the Bidder Index

The **Bidder Index (BT)** for each compliant Bid will be calculated **per each Contract Area** by weighted attributes using the formula below:

$$B_T = 0.3 \times P_S + 0.7 \times T_S$$

where:

Ps = the Price Score for the Bid under consideration, calculated **per each Contract Area**

Ts = the Technical Score for the Bid under consideration

The **Price Score** will be calculated for each Bidder in accordance with the following formula:

$$P_S = (P_C/P_N) \times 100$$

where:

PC = Bid Price of the lowest acceptable Bidder, adjusted in terms of ITB 31.

PN = Bid Price under consideration, adjusted in terms of ITB 31.1

Provided that the Bid is substantially responsive, the Employer shall correct arithmetical errors on the following basis:

- (a) Only for unit price contracts, if there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the total price that is obtained by multiplying the unit price and quantity, the unit price shall prevail and the total price shall be corrected, unless in the opinion of the Employer there is an obvious misplacement of the decimal point in the unit price, in which case the total price as quoted shall govern and the unit price shall be corrected;
- (b) If there is an error in a total corresponding to the addition or subtraction of subtotals, the subtotals shall prevail and the total shall be corrected; and
- (c) If there is a discrepancy between words and figures, the amount in words shall prevail, unless the amount expressed in words is related to an arithmetic error, in which case the amount in figures shall prevail subject to (a) and (B).

The **Technical Score** will be calculated for each Bid in accordance with the following formula:

$$T_s = (T_f + T_x + T_c + T_m)$$

Where the various elements of the equation are defined and derived as follows:

ITEM	NON-PRICE ATTRIBUTES TECHNICAL / CAPACITY/ PDN ATTRIBUTES	MAX. POINTS	CLAUSES IN SEC.
TF	Financial Resources / Capacity Bid Declaration Form Line of Credit / Bank Rating Letter of Intent from Financial Institution	5 10 10	ITB20.1 ITB6.3(g) Data form 9
TX	Relevant Experience Comply with Experience Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References / Completion Certificates • Previous similar 3 Years Projects 	15 10	ITB6.2(b) ITB6.2(c)
TC	Relevant Competence: Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract Managers • Site Agents /Site Engineer • Foremen 	15 10 10	ITB6.2(e) ITB6.2(e) ITB6.2(e) ITB6.2(e)
TM	Plant Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per BDS ITB6.3(c) and Data Form 4 	15	ITB6.3(c) & ITB6.2(d)
TS	Technical Score	100	

Note: With reference to the Technical Score Table above, Bidders are required to fill in all the relevant Bidding Forms in Section III and to submit certified copies of supporting documentation that will enable the Evaluators to verify (and award points with regard to) the above-mentioned attributes.

Bidders that obtain more 70% passing margin of the technical score shall qualify for the financial evaluation