



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, IMMIGRATION, SAFETY AND SECURITY

Ministerial Head Quarters
Private Bag 13200
Windhoek

Tel: (061) 2922111
Fax: (061)2922185

ENQUIRIES: *Comm A. Nelumbu/ S.S.Salyonga*
Tel.: 061 – 209 3311 | E-mail Address: anelumbu@nampol.na / procurement@nampol.na

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Reference number of procurement: SC/RP/39-112/2024/25

Scope of Contract: The procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Architect, Quantity Surveyor, Electrical/Mechanical and Civil/Structural) to conduct feasibility study for the construction of Katima Mulilo Correctional Facility to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration, Safety and Security.

1. **Procurement method used:** Request for Proposal.
2. **Date of Invitation of Bids:** 25 April 2024.
3. **Closing date for submission of bids:** 07 June 2024 @ 10h00.
4. **Date and place of opening of bids:** 07 June 2024 @ 10h00 at Namibian Correctional Service bid box, Central Depot Dr Michael De Kock Street, Northern Industrial Area, Windhoek.
5. **Number of bids received by closing date:** Thirteen (13).
6. **Number of bids received late:** None.
7. **The Bid Evaluation Table for Bid No. SC/RP/39-112/2024/25, The procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Architect, Quantity Surveyor, Electrical/Mechanical and Civil/Structural) to conduct feasibility study for the construction of Katima Mulilo Correctional Facility to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration, Safety and Security.**

8. Phase One: Mandatory Documents and Eligibility Criteria of the procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Architect, Quantity Surveyor, Electrical/Mechanical and Civil/Structural) to conduct feasibility study for the construction of Katima Mulilo Correctional Facility to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration, Safety and Security

8.1 During the first phase of the examination and evaluation process, the Committee assessed the compliance of the bidders with respect to the requirements for provision of mandatory documents and other eligibility information as required in the bidding document.

8.2 A total of thirteen (13) bidders were evaluated of which seven (07) were eliminated for failing to comply with some requirements as indicated in the table below. Meanwhile six (06) bidders were found to have complied with all the requirements and were therefore moved to the next phase.

The table below shows the examination and evaluation of the mandatory documents.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF THE BID NO: SC/R/39-112/2024/2025 (ARCHITECTS) STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS (PHASE 01)

REQUIREMENTS										
S/N O.	BIDDERS NAME	CRC	BSD	VEEC	GSTC	GSSCC	Written Under Taking	Bid Submission Form	Authorized signatory letter /Power of Attorney	Ineligibility / debarred
01.	Una Stuurman Architects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02.	Kondjeni Nkandi Architects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
03.	Agapitus and Associates Architects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (signed but no company seal)	Yes	No	No

**ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF THE BID NO: SC/R/39-112/2024/2025 (QUANTITY SURVEYORS) STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
(PHASE 01)**

REQUIREMENTS										
S/NO	BIDDERS NAME	CRC	BSD	VEEC	GSTC	GSSCC	Written Under Taking	Bid Submission Form	Authorized signatory letter /Power of Attorney	Ineligibility / debarred
01.	Shivute and Associates Quantity Surveyor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (but sole owner)	No
02.	Kashala and Partners Quantity Surveyor	Yes	Yes (but wrong project name)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (but sole owner)	No
03.	Shaun Jarmann and Associates Quantity Surveyor	Yes	No	Copy (not original certificate)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
04.	Sarel Burger Quantity Surveyor	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No (but sole owner)	No
05.	Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF THE BID NO: SC/R/39-112/2024/2025 (ELECTRICAL/MECHANICAL) STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS (PHASE 01)

REQUIREMENTS										
S/NO	BIDDERS NAME	CRC	BSD	VEEC	GSTC	GSSCC	Written Under Taking	Bid Submission Form	Authorized signatory letter /Power of Attorney	Ineligibility / debarred
01.	Decka Consulting CC	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02.	Arcade Consulting	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
03.	Lithon Consulting (bidding using Synergy Engineering)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Expired	Yes	Yes	No	No

All Electrical/Mechanical consultants were not complaint with the mandatory documents requirement.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF THE BID NO: SC/R/39-112/2024/2025 (CIVIL/STRUCTURAL) STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS (PHASE 01)

(PAGE 01)

REQUIREMENTS										
S/NO	BIDDERS NAME	CRC	BSD	VEEC	GST C	GSS CC	Written Under Taking	Bid Submission Form	Authorized signatory letter /Power of Attorney	Ineligibility / debarred
01.	CEPM & Partners Engineers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
02.	Windhoek Consulting Engineers (PTY) LTD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

CRC= Valid Certified Copy Company Registration Certificate,

GSTC = Valid Original Good Standing Tax Certificate,

GSSCC = Valid Original Good Standing Social Security Commission Certificate,

VEEC= Valid Certified Copy Employment Equity Commission Certificate,

BSD = Bid Securing Declaration.

- 8.3 The seven (07) bidders that were disqualified in the examination and evaluation of phase one (1) bid (eligibility criteria/mandatory documents) are as follows;
- 8.3.1 Agapitus and Associates Architects: Bidder was disqualified for not stamping a company seal on the Written Under Taking.
- 8.3.2 Kashala and Partners Quantity Surveyor: Bidder was disqualified for attaching the Bid Securing Declaration which has a wrong project name.
- 8.3.3 Shaun Jarmann and Associates Quantity Surveyor: Bidder was disqualified for submitting a copy of Employment Equity Commission Certificate which is not original certified.
- 8.3.4 Sarel Burger Quantity Surveyor: Bidder was disqualified for not submitting a Bid Securing Declaration
- 8.3.5 Decka Consulting CC: Bidder was disqualified for not submitting a Bid Securing Declaration
- 8.3.6 Arcade Consulting: Bidder was disqualified for not submitting a Bid Securing Declaration
- 8.3.7 Lithon Consulting: Bidder was disqualified for using Synergy Engineering and Good Standing Social Security Commission Certificate is expired.
- 8.4 The under listed six (06) bidders qualified for the second phase which was Technical Evaluation;
- 8.4.1 Una Stuurman Architects
- 8.4.2 Kondjeni Nkandi Architects
- 8.4.3 Shivute and Associates Quantity Surveyor
- 8.4.4 Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyors
- 8.4.5 Windhoek Consulting Engineers (Proprietary) Limited
- 8.4.6 CEPM & Partners Engineers

9. The bid examination and evaluation of phase two (02) bids (Technical evaluation) as follows:

9.1 PHASE 02: TECHNICAL EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION

Technical Scores/Ranking

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Point Allocation	Max Points	Architects		Quantity Surveyors		Civil/Structural Engineers	
				Una Stuurman Architects	Kondjeni Nkandi Architects	Shivute and Associates Quantity Surveyor	Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyor	Windhoek Consulting Engineers (PTY) LTD	CEPM & Partners Engineers
1. Experience i) Specific experience of the Consultants (company) relevant to the assignment (a) Years of experience (5 points) > 15 years 11 - 15 years 6 - 10 years 1-5 years < 1 year (b) No of similar nature of projects (5 points) <i>(Projects inline with the scope)</i>	(a) Years of Experience	5 4 3 2 1	10	09	10	08	09	10	10
	(b) No of projects	5 3 1							
2. Methodology and Work Plan (ii) Adequacy of the proposed methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference a) Technical approach and methodology (10 points)			30	18	30	30	30	30	30

Below are the results of the final score for the technical evaluation.

Consultant Name	Technical Score (Ts)	Rank
Architects		
Una Stuurman Architects	72	2
Kondjeni Nkandi Architects	93	1
Quantity Surveyor		
Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyor	96	1
Shivute and Associate Quantity Surveyor	88	2
Electrical/Mechanical		
None	None	None
Civil/Structural		
CEPM & Partners Engineers	90	2
Windhoek Consulting Engineers (PTY) LTD	94	1

10. The bid examination and evaluation of phase three (03) bids (Financial Evaluation)

10.1 The Committee examined and evaluated the six (06) bidders, as per undermentioned table during the third phase and the outcome was as follows:

The final scores as per the disciplines:

Discipline: Architects

No	Bidder	Tender offer (F)	Lowest price (Fm)	Financial score (Sf)	Revised Sf (P)	Technical Score (St)	Revised (T)	Final Score (S)	Final Rank
1	Una Stuurman Architects	14,510.52	14,510.52	100.00	20.00	72	57.6	77.60	1
2	Kondjeni Nkandi Architects	255,362.74		5.68	1.14	93	74.4	75.54	2

Discipline: Quantity Surveyors

No	Bidder	Tender offer (F)	Lowest price (Fm)	Financial score (Sf)	Revised Sf (P)	Technical Score (St)	Revised St (T)	Final Score (S)	Final Rank
1	Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyor	3,627.63		100.00	20.00	88	70.40	90.40	1
2	Shivute and Associates Quantity Surveyor	8,661.43	3,627.63	41.88	8.38	96	76.80	85.18	2

Discipline: Civil/Structural Engineers

No	Bidder	Tender offer (F)	Lowest price (Fm)	Financial score (Sf)	Revised Sf (P)	Technical Score (St)	Revised St (T)	Final Score (S)	Final Rank
1	CEPM & Partners Engineers	486,349.42		77.34	15.47	90	72	87.47	2
2	Windhoek Consulting Engineers (PTY) LTD	376,125.74	376,125.74	100.00	20.00	94	75.2	95.2	1

10.2 After the Technical evaluation, the team proceeded to the financial proposals and evaluated the consultant teams on a maximum scoring of 20 marks for the best financial offer in terms of the proposals submitted in accordance with the terms of reference.

10.3 A scoring matrix was used as shown below to compare the lowest available offer to the other offers and this provided a scoring Fs which was ultimately added to the Technical score to come up with a final ranking order. The following formulae were used for the scoring matrix:

$$Sf = 100 \times \frac{Fm}{F}$$

$$P = Sf \times 0.2$$

$$T = St \times 0.8$$

$$S = P + T$$

11. Best Evaluated Bids:

11.1 Based on the above tables on technical and financial evaluation results, the recommended consultants for award as per discipline are as following.

Discipline	Bidder	Offer	Comments
Architects	Una Stuurman Architects	N\$14,510.52	Recommended based on the highest final score
Quantity Surveyors	Tom Van Wyk Quantity Surveyor	N\$3,627.63	Recommended based on the highest final score
Civil/Structural	Windhoek Consulting Engineers (PTY) LTD	N\$376,125.74	Recommended based on the highest final score
Electrical and Mechanical	None	None	All the consultants did not make it to the second stage of Technical Evaluation. Bid to be re-tendered.


ETIENNE MARITZ
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


 2024-08-06
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR