



SAFE ROADS TO PROSPERITY

ROADS AUTHORITY
Private Bag 12030
Ausspannplatz
Windhoek
NAMIBIA

NOTICE OF AWARD

**BID REFERENCE NO: W/ONB/RA-23/2023: ROUTINE MAINTENANCE OF BITUMEN
ROADS- KEETMANSHOOP REGION, MARIENTAL CONTRACT AREA**

Award Date	Company/Entity Awarded	Awarded Amount
19 June 2024	Zhylem Trading Enterprises	N\$ 11 614 324.15 (incl. 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 (Mariental Area)]

Procurement Reference No: W/ONB/RA-23/2023

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Routine Maintenance of Bitumen Roads: Keetmanshoop Region (Mariental Area)

- 1. Scope of Contract:** Works
- 2. Procurement method used:** Open National Bidding
- 3. Date of Invitation of Bids:** 11 September 2023
- 4. Closing date for submission of bids:** 16 November 2023
- 5. Date and place of opening of bids:** 16 November 2023 at 11:05

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 61 bids were received.

- 7. Responsiveness of bids:**

11% bid responsiveness rate as 7 out of 61 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	Ngatajosi Road Construction and Renovation CC AND Ozombara Construction and Renovation CC	11,636,643.66	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bid submission not duly filled in as per ITB sub-clause 14 (Clause (c) bidder indicated price after the discount to be none while no discount is offered) (Clause (k) bidder deleted wrong entity type) - Power of Attorney is vague in that the bidder is a JV, but the power of delegated authority is only signed by one party of the JV. -In the absence of a clear Power of Attorney for the JV, endorsed by both members of the entities, as per ITB Sub-clause 21.2. -No evident delegated power of attorney for the individual who signed the Bid as per ITB sub-clause 21.2.
2	Venmart Investment CC	12,738,394.75	NO	<p>The water trailer proposed in the asset register does not refer to the water tank capacity, and the water trailer listed on the coastal hire letter of intent refers to 2500L, thus not complained to notice 1 to bidders as amended in ITB 6.2(d).</p> <p>The financial year ended 31 August, but no financials for 2023 were provided, though financials for 2020-2022 were provided.</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
3	JJ Garus-Oab Investments CC	11,967,542.85	NO	- Foreman does not have level 3 qualifications as per notice 1 to bidders ITB 6.2(e) as amended.
4	LP Investment CC	13,430,499.25	NO	-Social Security Certificate expired before the closing date as amended in notice 1 as per (ITB Sub-clause 13.1 (d) 3)
5	NRK Technical Services Cc	13,479,445.50	NO	The water Trailer did not indicate the water tank capacity, and the Drum roller(double) did not indicate that it is 500kg. As per notice 1 to bidders, BDS clause 6.2(e) - The contract manager does not have a grade 12 appearing in the document, filled in as well as the foreman has no level 3 at NQA level per notice 1 to bidders ITB 6.2(e) as amended
6	PMPH & Construction CC	12,078,740.61	NO	- In the asset register list, referred to as the optional plants to be hired, but no letter of intent from a reputable hiring company is submitted; the only plant owned is an LVD in the optional plant as per Ref. BDS sub- clause 6.2(d) - I.D. of the proposed foreman not certified as per BDS sub-clause 6.2-(e)

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
7	Ekuma Investment cc	12,092,261.50	NO	- No asset register and no indication of how to acquire the equipment, submitted as per Ref. BDS sub-clause 6.2(d)
8	Not allocated to a bidder	N/A	N/A	N/A
9	LEXSON TRADING CC	13,013,100.00	NO	<p>The bidder has not submitted reference letters for a total of 5 years; however, the bidder complies with N\$1.5 million of the total value of the work. The reference submitted totalled only 2 years and 3 months, as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(c).</p> <p>- Bidder has not submitted a reference letter for the required total of 3 years as per Ref. BDS sub-clause 6.2(d)</p> <p>- The water Trailer is not indicated to be 5000L, and the proposed heavy load vehicle has no description of the loading capacity as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)</p>
10	SHIVELI TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	13,332,007.50	NO	<p>- No asset register was provided for optional plants, and no consent letter from a reputable hiring company or proof that they own them. The water trailer is provided as such that its 1000L, not 5000L, as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)</p> <p>- Only submitted annual financial statement for 2023, which was supposed to be for 3 years as per Ref. BDS sub-clause 6.2(f).</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
11	TOKAR INVESTMENT GROUP CC	12,828,480.00	NO	- Social Security certificate, expired before the closing date as amended in notice 1 as per (ITB Sub-clause 13.1 (d) 3)
12	ROYAL CONTRACTORS	14,355,014.29	NO	Not within the Standard Deviation of -1 or +1 The bidders' prices do not fall within the Public Entity's price envelope (10% up and 15% down) as per Clause 52 (12) of the Public Procurement Act of 2015 No. 15
13	REALMAN TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,385,511.50	NO	- Power of attorney is not endorsed by the other managing member. Therefore, we can't prove that delegated authority is valid as per ITB Sub-clause 21.2. - Power of attorney is not endorsed by the other managing member. Therefore, we can't prove that delegated authority is valid as per ITB Sub-clause 21.2. - Power of attorney is not endorsed by the other managing member. Therefore, we can't prove that delegated authority is valid as per ITB Sub-clause 21.2.
14	ROUWANS INVESTMENT CC	13,906,173.75	NO	- No, notice to bidder attached as per notice to bidder ITB sub-Clause 1.1
15	MUHUUAJE INVESTMENT CC	11,184,883.34	NO	- No power of attorney was provided, although it appears a partnership is in place as per ITB sub-clause 21.2

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				- No power of attorney was provided, although it appears a partnership is in place as per ITB sub-clause 21.2
16	TUYAPENI TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,628,050.96	NO	- Only submitted annual financial statements for 2020 and 2023, only for two years, which was supposed to be for 3 years as per ITB 6.2(f)
17	GOLDEN WEST INVESTMENT CC	11,532,535.65	NO	-Bidder indicated that water trailer is 3000L, not 5000L as per notice1, to bidder provided in BDS sub-clause 6.2(e) -No current annual financial statements. The bidder provided only for the years 2019, 2020 and 2021 as per BDS Clause 6.2(f).
18	NDES CIVIL WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION CC JV- CAG TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,651,105.66	NO	The affirmative action certificate for CAG Trading is not valid. The certificate has expired.
19	LAU TOM CONSTRUCTION SUPPLY AND CIVIL SERVICES CC	12,497,372.00	NO	-Provisions on the bid submission for the amount in words do not correspond to the amount in figures as per ITB sub-clause 14 - The BOQ Summary page is not signed nor dated in the book of supporting documents as per ITB sub-clause 21.2

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
20.	MOZA INVESTMENT CC	17,707,163.81	NO	Both bid submissions in the bidding document and in the book of supporting documents have not been duly filled in. In the bidding document, the provision for the amount after the discount is indicated as N\$0.00, while the bid submission in the book of supporting documents is missing the bid validity period. -No Company Seal (Stamp) on bid submission form as per (ITB Sub-clause 14) -No valid bid submission form to confirm the bid validity as per ITB Sub-clause 19
21	CENTURION INVESTMENT (PTY) LTD	13,770,902.98	NO	The bidder did not indicate the water trailer capacity as per notice 1 to bidders. -Motor grader and tuck grader-shoulder repair equipment appear on the asset register as to be leased from a reputable hiring company, but they do not appear on the list provided by Coastal Hire company as per BDS Clause 6.2(d) - The Bidder's proof of working capital (from the Development Bank Of Namibia) does not state the amount of N\$300,000.00 as per ITB 6.2(g)
22	AKULYANGA TRADING CC	11,980,923.10	NO	- Power of Attorney not signed by both owners as per ITB sub-clause 21.2
23	ALUGODHI CONSTRUCTION	12,078,756.59	NO	-No amount indicated for clause (c) after discount offered but left blank. As per ITB sub: clause 14

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
	AND RENOVATION CC			
24	FUSION INVESTMENT CC	12,876,964.58	NO	The bidder indicated that the water trailer is 2500L instead of 5000L per notice 1 to bidders. Optional plants, i.e Pneumatic roller, Backhoe, Motor grader, tractor with mower, Tipper truck, LDV and tuck tower grader, are not listed as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)
25	HIAMUTITI U INVESTMENT CC	12,648,829.30	NO	- Attachment 23 under the supporting documents page is not signed nor initialled as per ITB Sub-clause 21.2
26	NJAMO BUILDERS CC	14,477,137.48	NO	Not within the Standard Deviation of -1 or +1 The bidders' prices do not fall within the Public Entity's price envelope (10% up and 15% down) as per Clause 52 (12) of the Public Procurement Act of 2015 No. 15
27	MENDOZER INVESTMENT CC	13,282,850.75	NO	- A 5-ton truck is listed on the asset register as to be leased; however, no lease agreement has been submitted, nor is it on the coastal hire letter for the intended rent of machinery. As per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
28	TUCKER BUILDERS & CIVIL WORKS CC	13,443,827.75	NO	Incomplete BOQ. No rate was provided for item number 2.5: section number and description (d) e/o using etb and base repair, and no percentage rate was provided. As per ITB clause 14.1 (f)
29	CREATIVE CONSTRUCTION CC	12,402,951.25	NO	- Bid submission form not duly filled in as per (ITB Sub-clause 14)
30	GECKOR FIFTY EIGHT INVESTMENTS GROUP (PTY) LTD	12,078,740.95	YES	N/A
31	NDINEPANDA TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,100,903.75	NO	The Social Security Good standing is not valid at the time of bid closure. (The date indicated for validity is 12 November 2023, while the bid closed on 16 November 2023)
32	MINDPOWER INVESTMENT CC	12,636,435.75	NO	- Bidder indicated that the water trailer is 1000L instead of 5000L as per notice 1 to the bidders under BDS Clause 6.2(e)
33	BAOBAB TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	11,392,167.17	YES	N/A
34	NILOTSE INVESTMENT CC	12,154,068.25	NO	- No Asset register was submitted by the bidder, and the water trailer loading capacity provided is 3500 liters instead of 5000 liters as per notice 1 to bidders and as from the BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				The bank letter for the working capital refers to the wrong procurement reference number and the procurement activities, as per BDS ITB 6.3(g).
35	EFINDANO MAINTENANCE AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES CC	11,819,980.77	YES	N/A
36	JAMES & YOUNG TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,553,462.68	NO	<p>- No indication of the water trailer tank capacity as per notice 1 to bidders. Motor grader indicated to be rented on the asset register but no rental agreement nor intent to rent letter submitted.</p> <p>- Tuck tower grader indicated to be rented on the asset register, but no rental agreement nor intent to rent letter was submitted as per BDS Clause 6.2(d)</p>
37	DANNY'S BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CC	12,218,750.00	NO	- Bidder has not indicated the water trailer capacity on the asset register, either owned or from his letter of authorisation to hire himself plants or from the coastal Hire company or the Barloworld Equipment company. Bidder did not also indicate the capacity on the attached Part E: proposed equipment form page 77 in the attached supporting

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				document book as well as in the bidding documents. as per BDS Clause 6.2 (d)
38	TRY HARDER CONSTRUCTION CC	12,102,738.00	NO	-No asset register submitted as per notice 1 to bidders. although all plants are listed on the coastal hire letter to rent. And, the plant form (Part E: proposed equipment) is not completed as per BDS clause 6.2(d) for all equipment
39	CHW TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	16,517,446.56	NO	The Social Security Good standing is not valid at the time of bid closure. (The date indicated for validity is 11 November 2023, while the bid closed on 16 November 2023)
40	GAMON ELECTRICAL & CONSTRUCTION CC	12,121,680.20	NO	- Bid submission not duly filled in, clause (c) indicates that price after discount to be NONE as per (ITB Sub-clause 14)
41	SAXAM INVESTMENT CC	13,900,771.40	NO	- Bid submission not duly filled in refers to incorrect procurement reference number and contract number "W/ONB/RA-23/2024" while it was supposed to be "W/ONB/RA-23/2023" and no bid validity period indicated as per ITB sub-clause 14.
42	SUMSENSO CONTRACTING CC	12,483,999.92	NO	- No bid validity indicated, as per ITB Sub-clause 19 - Bidder did not submit the financial statements for the last 3 years; Bidder submitted financials from 2019-2022, while financials need to be from 2020-

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				2023, given the bidder's financial year end is June. As per notice 1 sub-clause 6.2(f).
43	HNK TRADING CC	12,768,593.79	NO	-Both bid submission forms in the bidding document and book of supporting documents are not filled in as far as they relate to clause (C), where one refers to none and the other is blank, respectively, as per ITB-sub clause 14.
44	NAMSHINE INVESTMENT CC	13,403,595.00	NO	The asset register submitted does not contain all optional plants, though the bidder only indicated two plants; thus, there is no indication of timely acquisition of plant on part E3: proposed equipment form. The bidder did not fill it in as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(d)
45	PISCES INVESTMENT HOLDINGS NUMBER EIGHT CC	15,226,184.00	NO	- Bid submission not duly filled in, clause (c) indicates that price after discount to be ZERO while no discount offered as per ITB sub-clause 14
46	FA DEVELOPERS CC	14,475,005.00	NO	- Bid submission not duly filled in for both Clause (C) and (D); refers to incorrect procurement reference number "W/ONB/RA-21/2023" while it was supposed to be W/ONB/RA-23/2023" indicated as per ITB sub-clause 14

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
47	VIDU TRADING CC	12,745,527.98	NO	Incomplete BOQ, no rate provided for item number 2.18: section number and description Sealing with S.P. 2000 as per ITB clause 14.1 (f)
48	GORESEB TRADING CC	12,040,259.59	NO	<p>- Bidder indicated on their Part E3: proposed Equipment form that the water trailer or Box trailer is 3500KG, and on the lease from Coastal Hire, they proposed that the water Trailer will be 3000L instead of 5000L as per notice 1 to the bidder.</p> <p>- Tuck Tower grader is on the asset register as to be hired but not showing on the coastal to hire lease list as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(d)</p> <p>- Consent letters for use of CV for the contract manager and for the foreman didn't give to the bidder permission to be used by the bidder. As per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e)</p>
49	ALNAA CAPITAL INVESTMENTS JV HIGHWAY TRADING CC	12,370,964.58	YES	N/A
50	FLORIDA TRADING CC	12,441,250.76	NO	The bidder did not indicate the water capacity of the water trailer as per notice 1. Only the LDV and plate compactor from the optional plant are listed in the asset register, nor the leasing company as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(d).

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				The bidder did not submit all three years' annual financial statements; it only submitted for 2021 and 2023, but not 2022, as per notice 1 BDS Clause 6.2(f).
51	ONDJIRAKOMURUN GA CLEANING SERVICES CC	12,901,994.90	NO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POA only signed by one member as per ITB 21.2 - Member who signed the Bid is not duly authorised. POA is only signed by one member. - Member who signed the Bid is not duly authorised. POA is only signed by one member. - Bid submission not duly filled in the provision on Clause (C), which required the bidder to indicate their bid amount after the discount supplied bidder has stated "zero" as per ITB sub-clause 14
52	GLOBEX INVESTMENT CC	15,258,384.00	NO	
53	ZHYLEM TRADING ENTERPRISE CC	12,189,324.15	YES	N/A
54	ZERO SIX FIVE TRADING CC	10,659,235.00	NO	<p>Not within the Standard Deviation of -1 or +1</p> <p>The bidders' prices do not fall within the Public Entity's price envelope (10% up and 15% down) as per Clause 52 (12) of the Public Procurement Act of 2015 No. 15</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
55	NYANDEE INVESTMENT CC	16,278,493.57	NO	- Bid submission not dully filed in, where signature is required, bidder provided the date. As per ITB clause 14
56	NOVA INVESTMENT CC	12,440,750.51	NO	-Bidder's asset register is not fully completed with all plants and no supporting documents for all equipment. Equipment forms not completed. Nor mention of mandatory and optional plants as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(d) - Consent letters for the use of CVs for both the contract manager and the foreman bear an incorrect procurement number, "W/ONB/RA-23/2022", as per BDS sub-clause 6.2(e) - Financial statements do not include 2022; only two financial years were submitted for 2023 and 2021, not as per Ref. BDS sub-clause 6.2(f)
57	KAUNA BUILDER CC	14,467,285.55	NO	Not within the Standard Deviation of -1 or +1 The bidders' prices do not fall within the Public Entity's price envelope (10% up and 15% down) as per Clause 52 (12) of the Public Procurement Act of 2015 No. 15
58	HUI TANI TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	12,474,032.72	NO	-The plate compactor of the optional plants does not appear on the asset register or on the lease list of the hiring company. The water trailer did not indicate

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				<p>the water capacity. As per Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (d)</p> <p>The contract manager does not have a grade 12, and the Foreman does not have an artisanal level 3 qualification as per notice 1 BDS sub-Clause 6.2(e)</p> <p>The bidder's financial statements are incomplete. The years 2022 and 2023 are missing. The bidder provided only the 2021 (relevant) year per BDS sub-clause 6.2(f).</p> <p>-Bidder, proof of working capital from the bank does not state the amount of N\$300,000.00 as per ITB 6.2(g)</p>
59	OLUKONDA TRADING ENTERPRISES	15,610,032.82	NO	<p>-Bid submission not duly filled in, validity period not filled in as per ITB sub-clause 14</p> <p>- No valid bid submission form to confirm the bid validity. As per ITB sub-clause 19</p>
60	FN GROUP OF COMPANIES PTY	12,894,311.75	NO	<p>- Bid submission not duly filled in, validity period not filled in as per ITB sub-clause 14</p> <p>-No power of attorney submitted as per ITB sub-clause 21.2</p> <p>-No power of attorney was submitted as per ITB sub-clause 21.2; therefore, we cannot prove that delegated authority is valid.</p>

BIDDER'S NUMBER	BIDDER'S NAME	PRICING AT BID OPENING N\$	RESPONSIVE OR NOT RESPONSIVE (YES/ NO)	REASONS WHY BID IS NOT RESPONSIVE
				- No power of attorney was submitted as per ITB sub-clause 21.2; therefore, we cannot prove that delegated authority is valid.
61	CARAT INVESTMENTS CC	13,539,548.00	NO	-No asset register and the letter of intent from coastal hire does not include plate compactor as per BDS Clause 6.2 (d) -No indication of related experience on the CVs of the proposed Contract Manager and foreman. The Foreman does not meet the minimum education requirement. As per BDS sub-clause 6.2 (e)
62	PELICO ENGINEERING GROUP CC	12,078,744.40	YES	N/A
63	POTENZA INVESTMENTS CC	12,808,988.82	YES	N/A

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

a. Contract Area KHP-11: NB notes at the bottom of the table

Complete Name Bidder	Price at Bid Opening (N\$)	Corrected Price after Arithmetic Correction (N\$)	Within +1 or -1 of STD. DEV	Apply Marginal Price Preference	Adjusted after Marginal price preference (N\$)	Ranking
Baobab Trading Enterprises CC	11,392,167.17	11,381,630.00	YES	YES	10,392,168.01	1
Zhylem Trading Enterprise CC	12,189,324.15	11,614,324.15	YES	YES	11,149,751.18	2
Efindano Maintenance and Construction Services CC	11,819,980.77	11,819,980.77	YES	YES	11,228,981.73	3
Geckor Fifty Eight Investments Group (PTY) LTD,	12,078,740.95	12,078,740.95	YES	YES	11,595,591.31	4
Pelico Engineering Group CC	12,078,744.40	12,078,744.40	YES	YES	11,595,594.62	5
Alnaa Capital Investments JV Highway Trading CC	12,370,964.58	12,370,964.58	YES	YES	11,752,416.35	6
Potenza Investments CC	12,808,988.82	12,808,988.82	YES	YES	\$12,296,629.27	7

9. Best Evaluated Bid for area:

Area: BMU-KHP11

Bidder No	Bidder Name	Bidder Price N\$	COMMENTS
33	Baobab Trading Enterprises CC	11,381,630.00	RECOMMENDED FOR AWARD