

SAFE ROADS TO PROSPERITY

ROADS AUTHORITY  
Private Bag 12030  
Ausspannplatz  
Windhoek  
NAMIBIA


# NOTICE OF AWARD

BID NO: W/ONB/RA-13/2022: SALT ROAD MAINTENANCE CONTRACT IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION

Award Date	Company/Entity Awarded	Awarded Amount
18 October 2023	John Namusheshe Construction Kambwa Construction (PTY) Ltd	JV N\$ 26 849 598.34 (inclusive taxes).



**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. Kadzikwa, Mr P. Greeff, Dr. G. Tshoopara



# **ROADS AUTHORITY**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT**

---

***SALT ROAD MAINTENANCE IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION***

---

Procurement Reference No: ***W/ONB/RA-13/2022***

**Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report**

## SALT ROAD MAINTENANCE IN THE OTJIWARONGO REGION

**Reference number of procurement:** W/ONB/RA-13/2022

- 1. Scope of Contract:** Salt Road Maintenance in the Otjiwarongo Region
- 2. Procurement method used:** Open National Bidding
- 3. Date of Invitation of Bids:** 12 December 2022
- 4. Closing date for submission of bids:** 09 March 2023
- 5. Date and place of opening of bids:** 09 March 2023, Roads Authority Head Office, Windhoek
- 6. Number of bids received by closing date:** 15
- 7. Responsiveness of bids:**

Bidder's Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive e (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
John Namusheshe Construction JV Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd		Yes	N/A
Emirates Trading cc		No	Good standing certificate submitted for Tax is in the name of Per-Eric Eagles T/A P E Eagles and therefore not valid (ITB Sub-clause 13.1 (d) 2).
Clouds Trading Enterprises cc		No	<p>1.Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence of Monetary value of works completed as per BDS Clause 6.2 (b),</p> <p>2.Bidder has not submitted evidence of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>3.No letter of consent to use CV has been submitted for Foreman as required in BDS Clause 6.2 (e), And according to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>4.The Bidder did not submit certified copies of Annual Financial Statements as filed at the Registrar of Companies of the last three (3) years as per BDS Clause 6.2 (f),</p> <p>5.Bidder has not submitted a letter of intent from the bank or any evidentiary proof of working capital in the form as indicated in: Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (g) at all,</p>

<b>Bidder's Name</b>	<b>Pricing at Bid Opening N\$</b>	<b>Responsive e (Yes/ No)</b>	<b>Reasons why bid is not responsive</b>
			<p>6. Bidder has not submitted evidentiary proof in the form of a letter of intent and none of the reference letters have contract amounts of an average annual financial amount of construction works of N\$ 6,000,000 in 2 (two) years over the last 5 (five) years. Ref. BDS Clause 6.3 (a),</p> <p>7. Bidder has not submitted a written letter of permission for the Employer to seek references from the Bidder's bankers for clarifications. Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (h).</p>
Geckoh Fifty Eight Investments Group (Pty) Ltd		No	<p>1. Bidder has listed relevant projects, but has not submitted evidential letters of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>2. According to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>3. The bidder has not listed essential plant, namely: 4x16kl water bowsers, 1x 25kl water bowser, 3x saltwater pumps, a bulldozer and an additional Grader, nor did they make sufficient provision for the acquisition of these equipment. Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c).</p>
Ipilak Construction JV Royal Contractors		No	<p>1. Bidder has submitted letters that do not show relevant experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>2. According to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e).</p>
KL Construction (Pty) LTD		No	<p>1. The letters submitted by the bidder do not indicate contract amounts and therefore don't have sufficient evidence of Monetary value of works completed as per BDS Clause 6.2 (b),</p> <p>2. Bidder submitted letters that do not indicate contract amount, length or duration, and therefore do not have sufficient</p>

<b>Bidder's Name</b>	<b>Pricing at Bid Opening N\$</b>	<b>Responsive e (Yes/ No)</b>	<b>Reasons why bid is not responsive</b>
			<p>evidence of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>3. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the ownership of essential plant in the form of registration certificates and license disks, namely: Excavator, Grader, Loader, 2x Tipper Trucks, and the following are not listed: 3x Saltwater pumps, Bulldozer as per Ref. BDS clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c),</p> <p>4. According to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient years of experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>5. Bidder has submitted a letter from the bank that is not signed, therefore they are either not listed and no evidentiary proof of working capital in the form as indicated in: Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (g),</p> <p>6. Bidder has not submitted evidentiary proof of an average annual financial amount of construction works of \$N 6,000,000 in 2 (two) years over the last 5 (five) years as no contract amounts are listed in the letters. Ref. BDS Clause 6.3 (a).</p> <p>7. Bidder has not attached a letter nor completed the form on information regarding any litigation as per Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (i)</p>
Quiver Tree Investments 13 (Pty) Ltd	33,234,043.51	No	<p>1. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the ownership of essential plant in the form of registration certificates and license disks, namely: Grader and Excavator. Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c),</p> <p>2. Bidder has submitted a letter from the bank that is not signed nor stamped, therefore there is no evidentiary proof of working capital in the form as indicated in: Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (g),</p> <p>3. Bidder submitted a letter from the bank that is not stamped nor signed, therefore evidentiary proof of Performance Guarantee</p>

<b>Bidder's Name</b>	<b>Pricing at Bid Opening N\$</b>	<b>Responsive e (Yes/ No)</b>	<b>Reasons why bid is not responsive</b>
			is not sufficient as per Ref. BDS Clause ITB 40.1
Namibia Welding Building & Civil Works		No	<p>1. The letters submitted by the bidder show that the monetary value of the works completed do not total 30million. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence of monetary value of works completed as per BDS Clause 6.2 (b),</p> <p>2. Bidder has not submitted letters indicating evidence of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>3. According to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient years of experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>4. The letters submitted by the bidder, do not average an annual financial amount of construction works of \$N 6,000,000 in 2 (two) years over the last 5 (five) years. Ref. BDS Clause 6.3 (a).</p>
Alugodhi Engineering & Construction		No	<p>1. Bidder has not submitted letters showing proof of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>2. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the ownership of essential plant, namely: Graders, Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c)</p> <p>3. According to the Foreman's CV, the foreman does not have sufficient experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e).</p>
LP Investments cc		No	<p>1. The letters submitted by the bidder show that the monetary value of the works completed do not total 30million. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence of monetary value of works completed as per BDS Clause 6.2 (b),</p> <p>2. Bidder has submitted letters that do not indicate contract duration, and therefore do not have sufficient evidence of experience</p>

<b>Bidder's Name</b>	<b>Pricing at Bid Opening N\$</b>	<b>Responsive (Yes/ No)</b>	<b>Reasons why bid is not responsive</b>
			<p>in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>3. CV of Foreman as submitted by the bidder does not indicate sufficient years of experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>4. Bidder has submitted a letter from the bank that is not signed, therefore there is no evidentiary proof of working capital in the form as indicated in: Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (g),</p> <p>5. Letters submitted bidder do not average annual financial amount of construction works of N\$ 6,000,000 in 2 (two) years over the last 5 (five) years. Ref. BDS Clause 6.3 (a).</p>
Brandberg Construction cc		No	<p>1. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the ownership of essential plant, namely: Graders, Excavator, A Pick-Up, Loader and two Tipper Trucks. Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c)</p> <p>2. CV of Foreman as submitted by the bidder does not indicate any experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>3. Bidder has not submitted evidentiary proof of working capital in the form as indicated in: Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (g) and the letter from the bank is not stamped,</p> <p>4. Bidder submitted a letter from the bank that is not stamped, therefore evidentiary proof of Performance Guarantee is not sufficient as per Ref. BDS Clause ITB 40.1</p> <p>5. Bidder has not filled out the form nor provided information regarding any litigation as per Ref. BDS Clause 6.2 (i)</p>
FN Group of Companies (Pty) Ltd		No	Good standing certificate for Tax not valid as it expired on the 15 February 2023. (ITB Sub-clause 13.1 (d) 2).
Strydo Construction cc		No	1. The letters submitted by the bidder do not show contract amounts or durations to

Bidder's Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
			<p>prove sufficient evidence of monetary value of works completed as per BDS Clause 6.2 (b),</p> <p>2. The letters submitted by the bidder do not show contract amounts or durations to prove they have experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>3. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the ownership of essential plant, namely: Graders and a Bulldozer. Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c)</p> <p>6. CV of Foreman as submitted by the bidder does not indicate relevant experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e),</p> <p>4. Bidder has not submitted evidentiary proof of an average annual financial amount of construction works of \$N 6,000,000 in 2 (two) years over the last 5 (five) years. Ref. BDS Clause 6.3 (a)</p> <p>5. Bidder has not submitted evidence of experience in works of a similar nature and size as indicated as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c) i.e. No proof (completion certificates/letters) from clients stating previous contract value of works</p>
Danny's Building Construction cc		No	<p>1. Bidder has not submitted letters indicating reference of experience in works of a similar nature and size as per BDS Clause 6.2 (c),</p> <p>2. CV of Foreman as submitted by the bidder does not indicate any experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e).</p>
Volt Investments cc JV Bonga Trading JV Benguela Trading cc		No	<p>1. Bidder has not submitted sufficient evidence for the acquisition of a second 7m3 Tipper Truck Refer to clause 6.2 (d) and 6.3(c),</p> <p>2. CV of Foreman as submitted by the bidder does not indicate any experience in Salt Roads works as per BDS Clause 6.2 (e).</p>

8. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive:

Name	A. Price at Bid Opening (N\$)	B. Bid Price after corrections (N\$)	C. price after Adjustments (N\$)	D. Price after Margin of Preference <i>If applicable</i>	Rank
John Namusheshe Construction JV Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd	26,509,529.54	26,509,529.54	N/A	N/A	1

9. Best Evaluated Bid:

John Namusheshe Construction JV Kambwa Construction (Pty) Ltd, with a bid price of N\$ 26 509 529.54, is recommended for award of this bid.