



SAFE ROADS TO PROSPERITY

ROADS AUTHORITY
Private Bag 12030
Ausspannplatz
Windhoek
NAMIBIA

NOTICE OF AWARD

**BID REFERENCE NO: W/ONB/RA-24/2023: MAINTENANCE OF BITUMEN ROADS
IN THE KEETMANSHOOP REGION, KARASBURG CONTRACT AREA**

Award Date	Company/Entity Awarded	Awarded Amount
28 May 2023	Baobab Trading Enterprises cc	N\$ 12 097 391.62 including VAT



Established in terms of the Roads Authority Act, 1999 (Act 17 of 1999)
Board of Directors: Ms L. Brandt (Chairperson), Mr P. Muluti (Deputy Chairperson), Ms H. Amupolo, Mr T. Hamata,
Mr G. Kadhikwa, Mr P. Greeff, Dr. G. Tshoopara



SAFE ROADS TO PROSPERITY

ROADS AUTHORITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

**ROUTINE MAINTENANCE OF BITUMEN ROADS:
KEETMANSHOOP REGION – KARASBURG CONTRACT AREA**

Procurement Reference No: ***W/ONB/RA-24/2023***

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Cleaning of Rest Places and Road Reserve in the Rundu Region W/ONB/RA-06/2022

- 1. Scope of Contract:** Works
- 2. Procurement method used:** Open National Bidding
- 3. Date of Invitation of Bids:** 2023-09-11
- 4. Closing date for submission of bids:** 2023-10-10
- 5. Date and place of opening of bids:** 10 October 2023 at 10:50
Bids were submitted at the Roads Authority: Head Office, Corner of Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue & David Hosea Meroro Road, Southern Industrial Area, Windhoek
- 6. Number of bids received by closing date:** A total number of 63 bids were received.
- 7. Responsiveness of bids:**
14.3% bid responsiveness rate as 9 out of 63 received bids were responsive.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
1	Royal Contractors cc	18,741,694.30	YES	N / A
2	Vidu Trading cc	12,811,636.59	YES	N / A
3	Ngatajosi Road Construction JV Ozombara Construction and Renovations	12,251,716.82	No	1. The Memorandum of agreement for the JV agreement only indicates a signature for the one Party to the agreement.
4	Lau-Tom Construction Cc	13,564,213.20	No	1. The 5-Ton truck has no NaTIS Vehicle registration attached as proof of ownership. 2. The hand operated compactor submitted does not indicate compaction effort of at least 500-Kg. 3. There is no asset register listing the availability of: a) Pavement Breaker, b) Concrete Mixer, and c) Compressor.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
5	Green ANIM Technical Services Cc	12,930,519.50	No	1. Power of Attorney signed by one member of the CC only. The other Member of the Cc did not sign the authorization for signature.
6	Shiveli Trading Enterprises Cc	16,040,936.00	No	1. Amount offered after discount not indicated.
7	Rouwans Investments Cc	16,349,315.40	No	<p>1. Only one reference letter indicating completion of works including a monetary value of N\$ 401,211.49. The other references are either appointment letters or completion letter with no monetary value for works.</p> <p>2. Reference letters do not have duration of contract periods. Thus impossible to establish the total combined minimum threes as per ITB (BDS) 6.2c)</p> <p>3. Asset Register submitted does not indicates Pavement Breaker, nor hand operated drum roller of at least 500-kg. The water is listed as being leased however no NaTIS registration certificate is accompanying the said letter of intent to lease.</p> <p>4. Foreman has no minimum required qualifications</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
8	Hibachi Investment Holdings Pty Ltd	13,886,079.23	No	1. The foreman proposed submitted a National Diploma, wherein an Artisanal qualification was required. In addition, both Key Personnel did not submit consent letters for use of their CVs.
9	PMPH & Construction Cc	12,188,866.10	YES	N / A
10	Tokar Investment Group Cc	13,655,410.50	No	1. Total combined duration (period) of contract is 34-months. A total of 36-months is required. 2. Hand operated of at least 500-kg double drum roller indicated as being leased however, no letter of intent for lease indicated. 3. Foreman has no evidentiary of artisanal qualification.
11	Efindano Maintenance & Construction Cc	12,207,632.84	No	1. Reference do not show works of similar nature. References of works submitted are of a blading of gravel road nature. 2. Foremen has no artisanal qualification attached.
12	Readymix Investments Cc JV	12,661,327.50	No	1. The Power Attorney is deemed invalid because the Ownership of the one Party could not be determined for the submitted CC documents. In addition The Power of Attorney bears no signature of the one Party to the JV

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
	Ta/husen Investments Cc			agreement. 2. See comments of the power of attorney.
13	Njamo Builders Cc	12,661,327.50	No	1. Foremen has no artisanal qualification attached.
14	Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises Cc	13,024,121.75	YES	N / A
15	Potenza Investments cc	13,765,495.84	No	2. Foreman has no artisanal qualification submitted.
16	Namshine Investments cc	13,006,716.20	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled. 2. Page 3 of the 2023 annual financial statements is not initialled.
17	NRK Technical Services	13,534,668.09	No	1. Capacity of the Hand Operated double drum roller not indicated. 2. Minimum educational qualification of the Contracts Manager has not been met. Addotionally, foreman: Minimum educational qualification not met.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				<p>3. Bank letter attached indicates intent to issue a Performance Guarantee instead of a letter of intent for working capital.</p> <p>4. Letter of permission not attached to submitted bid.</p> <p>5. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.</p>
18	Realman Trading Enterprises Cc	12,737,103.30	No	<p>1. Power of Attorney signed by one member of the CC only. The other Member of the Cc did not sign the authorization for signature.</p> <p>2. Not all pages of the Bid were initialled.</p>
19	Olukonda Trading Enterprises	13,103,255.50	No	<p>1. Bid Submission not dully filled. Part C and Part D were left blank.</p> <p>2. No Period indicated.</p>
20	Alugodhi Engineering & Construction cc	12,189,950.14	No	<p>1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled. This observation id on both Bid Document and Book of Supporting documents.</p>
21	Hui Tani Trading Enterprises Cc	12,834,691.61	No	<p>1. The reference letters submitted i.e. 2 refer to appointment and/or award letters. The two references indicating completed works have a total monetary</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				<p>value of N\$ 862,916.45 this is less than the required N\$ 1.5Million.</p> <p>2. Total combined duration (period) of contract is 9-months. A total of 36-months is required.</p> <p>3. Project Manager: no minimum educational qualification attached. Foreman: has no artisanal qualification attached to the CV.</p> <p>4. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.</p>
22	Highway Trading Cc JV Alnaaa Capital Investment	12,758,427.57	No	1. Site Foreman: does not have an Artisanal Trade qualification.
23	Tuckers Builders & Civil Works Cc	13,972,032.43	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled.
24	Ndinependa Trading Enterprises cc	12,208,204.50	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
25	Moza Investments Cc	18,596,751.66	No	<p>1. A total of 7 Months of works has been determined from the availed reference letters. Furthermore, 8 of the references submitted do not indicate the duration of the projects.</p> <p>2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.</p> <p>3. Letter of permission not attached to submitted bid.</p> <p>4. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.</p>
26	Mendozer Investment cc	19,105,036.25	No	<p>1. No proof of 5-ton truck in both asset register and lease letter from coastal hire.</p> <p>2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman. The qualification submitted is a formal engineering diploma, and not an Artisanal.</p>
27	Ndakalimwe Investments Cc JV JDN Civil Engineers Cc	15,254,738.50	No	<p>1. No Pavement breaker nor compressor has been listed in the assets register.</p> <p>2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.</p> <p>3. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
28	CHW Tranding Enterprises cc	15,524,135.20	No	1. Good Standing social security commission not attached. Bidder submitted a registration certificate from SSC.
29	Pelico Engineering Group cc	12,910,397.72	No	1. Name of company not completed in the spaces provided for in the Bid Declaration form.
30	Golden West Investments Cc	13,778,734.95	No	1. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.
31	Creative Construction Cc	12,401,217.05	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled. (Refer to Part C of said Bid Submission Form).
32	Florida Trading Cc	12,580,006.40	No	1. No capacity indicated for the hand-operated double drum roller of 500-kg.
33	Akulyanga Trading Cc	12,115,882.50	No	1. Contract durations not indicated on reference letters, Reference from main contractors to sub-contractor not in the format or content as per ITB BDS 6.2 c.; wherein the letter should come from client to the main contractor bearing the sub-contractor's name.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				2. Letter of intent from Coastal hire bears the wrong Procurement reference number, additional equipment listed therein not in accordance with those required as per the BDS. Compressor, Pavement Breaker, Water trailer, 500-kg double drum roller not 4listed in assets register or anywhere else within the document.
34	Goreseb Trading cc	12,888,618.85	No	1. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.
35	FA Developer Cc	16,455,527.10	No	1. Forman's CV not initialised. Contracts Manager's CV (First two pages) not initialised.
36	Nessi Park Investments cc	13,044,565.37	No	1. No works related references are attached. The majority of reference attached indicate works related to blading of gravel roads, cleaning of rest places etc.
37	Ekuma Investmnets Cc	12,394,978.30	YES	N / A

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
38	JJ Garus-Oab Investment cc	12,939,312.40	No	1. The works indicated are not of a similar nature (i.e. merely electrical, kitchen and DSTv installation). The durations of these projects cannot be established from the reference letters. 2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.
39	Lexson Trading Cc	13,447,800.00	YES	N / A
40	Danny's Building Construction cc	12,228,833.20	YES	N / A
41	Sexam Investments Cc	15,707,192.23	No	1. Bid validity period not indicated.
42	Carat Investments Cc	14,276,303.62	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled. (Refer to Part C of said Bid Submission Form).

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
43	Hoanib Trading Enterprises Cc JV CSEG Investmnets	13,809,709.45	No	1. One of the ID Documents of the Owners has not been initialled. (Goagoseb Stevenes). 2. Reference letter (from Client) (Ref, BMU WHK WHK-07-2014 for Hoanib not initialled).
44	Pisces Invesment Holdings No.8 cc	16,334,728.80	No	1. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.
45	Mindpower Investments Cc	12,736,215.50	No	1. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman. 2. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.
46	Centurion Investments Pty Ltd	13,934,393.40	No	1. Bid validity period not indicated
47	Okakango General Dealers JV Muhuaajje Investment Cc	11,282,152.49	No	1. Bid Price after discount offered indicated as Not Applicable thus not dully filled. (Refer to Part C of said Bid Submission Form) 2. Person signing the Bid has no authorization from the JV agreement to sign the Bid.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
48	Sinvula Construction Cc	12,052,059.36	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proof of locale submitted. 2. Reference letter attached do have any monetary value. 3. A total of 9 Months of works has been determined from the availed reference letters. 4. Only equipment listed is a 5-Ton truck to be leased. However, no letter of intent to lease is attached. 5. No consent for the use of CV of the Contracts Manager. No proof of Artisanal qualifications for the Foreman. 6. No financial statements attached. 7. No proof of working capital is attached. 8. No bank permission letter is attached. 9. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.
49	Globex Investments Cc	16,242,153.80	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ID of Foreman accompanying CV not initialled

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
50	Geckoh Fifty Eight Investments Group	12,189,949.98	No	1. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.
51	Zero Six Five Trading cc	11,644,095.00	No	1. No Namibian ID submitted for the Contracts Manager.
52	Try Harder Construction Cc	12,277,682.90	No	1. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.
53	Nyandee Investments Cc	20,023,040.77	No	1. EEC not attached.
54	James and Young Trading Enterprises	12,723,174.32	YES	N / A
55	LP Investments Cc	13,744,514.80	No	1. Eight (8) Months of duration established from the 4 reference letters submitted. 2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
56	Zhylem Trading Enterprises	12,301,509.06	No	1. ID of owner/Contracts Manager not initialed.
57	Hiamutiti U Investments	14,601,814.50	No	1. Bidder's Page 2 of the Bill of Quantity is for a different Bidding document i.e. (W/ONB/RA-23/2023, Mariental Area)
58	Vulture Investments Cc	14,715,983.63	No	1. Double drum roller submitted has no indication of Capacity. Letter of intent to supply through purchase a trailer with quotation is not accompanied by letter from the bank referencing said quotation. 2. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.
59	Ondjirakomurungu Cleaning & Construction Cc	14,495,446.40	No	1. Only of two members of the Cc signed the power of attorney or authorization.
60	Nilotse Investments Cc	12,318,796.55	No	1. The proposal for the non-subcontracting of the works to a third party, has not been submitted.
61	Kauna Builders Cc	15,199,855.33	No	1. No proof of artisanal qualifications submitted for the Forman.

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
62	Baobab Trading Enterprises cc	12,097,391.62	YES	N / A
63	Amsterdam Engineering & Construction Cc	12,487,476.35	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All pages of the Bid Submission left blank. Thus not dully filled. 2. Company Registration Documents i.e. CC not initialled. 3. No validity period indicated.

8. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive per Contract Area

a. Contract Area KHP-01: NB notes at the bottom of table

Bidder Number	Complete Name Bidder	Corrected Price after Arithmetic Correction (N\$)	Within +1 or -1 of STD. DEV	Apply 5% Price Preference	Total Preference (%)	Adjusted after price preference (N\$)	Ranking
1	Royal Contractors cc	18,741,694.30	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Vidu Trading cc	12,811,636.59	YES	YES	6%	12,042,938.39	6
9	PMPH & Construction Cc	12,188,866.10	YES	YES	6%	11,457,534.13	2
14	Tuyapeni Trading Enterprises Cc	13,024,121.75	YES	YES	6%	12,242,674.45	7
37	Ekuma Investmnets Cc	12,394,978.30	YES	YES	3%	12,023,128.95	5
39	Lexson Trading Cc	13,447,800.00	YES	YES	6%	12,640,932.00	8
40	Danny's Building Construction cc	12,228,833.20	YES	YES	6%	11,495,103.21	3
54	James and Young Trading Enterprises	12,723,174.32	YES	YES	6%	11,959,783.86	4
62	Baobab Trading Enterprises cc	12,097,391.62	YES	YES	7%	11,250,574.21	1

9. Best Evaluated Bid For this Contract Area:

Bidder No	BIDDER NAME	Bidder Price N\$ (VAT Incl.)	COMMENTS
62	BAOBAB TRADING ENTERPRISES Cc	12,097,391.62	RECOMMENDED FOR AWARD