



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 Rita.Cloete/ S.S.Salyonga*
Tel.: 0819546401| E-mail Address: Rita.Cloete@ncs.gov.na

Executive Summary of Re-Bid Evaluation Report

Reference number of procurement: SC/RP/39-609/2024/2025

Scope of Contract: The procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Electrical/Mechanical) 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 March 2025.
3. **Closing date for submission of bids:** 30 April 2025 @ 10h00.
4. **Date and place of opening of bids:** 30 April 2025 @ 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:** Four (04).
6. **Number of bids received late:** None.
7. **The Bid Evaluation Table for Bid No. SC/RP/39-609/2024/2025, The procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Electrical/Mechanical) to conduct feasibility study for the construction of Katima Mulilo Correctional Facility to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration, Safety and Security**

**8.Restricted
Bidding
Process**

The bidding documents were issued to short listed vetted Electrical/Mechanical Engineers A total of five (05) bidders were invited. However, only four (04) bids were received from Mechanical/Electrical Engineers below.

No.:	Consultant (Mechanical/Electrical Engineers)
1.	Dreams Engineering.
2.	NMS Consulting Engineers
3.	Shield Force Consulting Engineers
4.	AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructures Manager (Pty) Ltd

AK Consulting Engineers did not submit its bid.

The following mandatory documents were also used as a criterion as listed in the REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL requirements in order to be considered for the technical evaluation, namely:

- a) A valid company registration certificate;
- b) An original valid good Standing Tax Certificate;
- c) An original valid good Standing Social Security Certificate;
- d) A valid certified copy of Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate, proof from Employment Equity Commissioner that bidder is not a relevant employer, or exemption issued in terms of Section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998;
- e) Bid Securing Declaration
- f) Written undertaking in terms of Section 138 of the Labour Act, 2015 and Section 50(2)(D) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015
- g) Bid Submission Form/Technical Proposal Submission Form
- h) Authorized Signatory Letter/Power of Attorney
- i) Salary and wages
- j) Ineligibility/debarred
- k) Conflict of Interest

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

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF THE BID NO: SC/RP/39-609/2024/2025 STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS (PHASE 01)

REQUIREMENTS												
NO	BIDDERS NAME	CRC	BSD	VEEC	GSTC	GSSCC	Salary and wages	Written Under Taking	Bid Submission Form	Authorized signatory letter /Power of Attorney	Ineligibility / debarred	Conflict of interest
01	Dreams Engineers.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
02	NMS Consulting Engineers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Attached	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
03	Shield Force Consulting Engineers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
04	AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructures Manager (Pty) Ltd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	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.

The following Engineers were compliant and shortlisted for the technical examination and evaluation:

1. Dreams Engineering Pty Ltd.
2. Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC
3. AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructures Manager (Pty) Ltd

10. Technical Evaluation

Qualification and experience of the Engineers shall be considered as the paramount requirement. The proposals were evaluated on the basis of a maximum of 80 marks for Technical Proposals and 20 marks for financial proposals. Proposals from Engineers who scored at least 50 marks for the Technical Proposals were retained for further consideration. Only those Consultants who scored a total of 70 marks on the overall assessment were considered for the assignment.

The categories for the above scoring was not classified in the bid document and the evaluation team compiled the following criteria and scoring for technical evaluation purposes:

Technical Evaluation Criteria:

Experience of Firm (10 marks)

Experience of Consultants' Firm/Company: evaluation points were awarded from **zero (0) to ten (10)** for this aspect of the proposal submission and points were awarded as follows:

- a) A score between 1 and 5 each for the years of experience of the firm/company.
- b) A score between 1 and 5 each for number of similar nature of project undertaken, with a maximum of above three projects.

Proposed Approach and Methodology, Timeframe and Deliverables (30 marks)

Adequacy of the proposed methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference. Evaluation points were awarded from zero (0) to ten (10) per each sub-criteria as follows:

- a) Technical approach and methodology
- b) Work Plan
- c) Organization and staffing

The points were awarded as follows: Poor = 3, Good = 5 and Excellent = 10.

Experience of Professional Staff (50 marks)

Expertise and experience of key personnel: evaluation points were awarded from **zero (0) to fifty (50)** for this aspect of the proposal submission and points were awarded as follows:

- a) The Principal Project Team Leader were awarded from **zero (0) to thirty (30)** points for professional registration status, experience in projects of similar nature, experience in projects in the same region and experience in any local language of the region.
- b) The Primary Project Member/Support were awarded from **zero (0) to twenty (20)** points for professional registration status, experience in projects of similar nature, experience in projects in the same region and experience in any local language of the region.

Participation of Nationals (10 marks)

Participation by nationals among proposed key staff: evaluation points were awarded from **zero (0) to ten (10)** depending on whether the firm/company had more or less than three Namibian nationals indicated as part of the key staff.

Below are the results of the final score for the technical evaluation. See detailed technical evaluation scored cards attached as Annexure 1, 2, and 3.

Consultant Name	Technical Score (Ts)	Rank
1. Dreams Engineering (Pty) Ltd	65	3
2. Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC	72.5	2
3. AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructure Managers (Pty)Ltd	85	1

Section II. Technical Evaluation Report—Forms

Form IIA. Evaluation Summary—Technical Scores/Ranking

Form II.A. Evaluation Summary Technical Scores/Ranking

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Point Allocation	Max Points	Mechanical/ Electrical Engineers		
				Dreams Engineering (Pty)Ltd	Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC	AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructure Managers (Pty)Ltd
1. Experience i) Specific experience of the Consultants (company) relevant to the assignment (a) Years of experience (5 points)	(a) Years of Experience			3	2	2
	> 15 years	5				
	11 - 15 years	4				
	6 - 10 years	3				
	1-5 years	2				
(b) No of similar nature of projects (5 points) <i>(Projects in line with the scope)</i>	< 1 year	1				
	(b) No of projects			5	3	5
	> 3 projects	5				
	2-3 projects	3				
2. Methodology and Work Plan (ii) Adequacy of the proposed methodology and work plan in responding to the Terms of Reference	0-1 projects	1				
			20	10	10	10

a) Technical approach and methodology (10 points) -The objectives of the assignment -Explanation of the technical approach -Methodology for carrying out the activities -Obtaining the expected output and the degree of detail of such output	Technical quality of (a), (b) & (c): Excellent = 10 Good = 5 Poor = 3				5	5	3	
b) Work plan (5 points) -Propose the main activities of the assignment, their content and duration, phasing and interrelations, milestones and delivery dates of the reports. -The proposed work plan should be consistent with the technical approach and methodology -Showing understanding of the TOR and ability to translate them into a feasible working plan					5	5		
c) Organization and staffing (5 points) -Propose the structure and composition of your team -List the main disciplines of the assignment -List the key expert responsible and proposed technical staff					5	5	5	
3. Professional Staff (iii) Key professional staff qualifications and competence for the assignment:		60	10					

a) Principal Project Team Leader - Mechanical (20 points)	a) Professional registration (10 points)	10			10	
	Experience in projects of similar nature (6 points)	6	6		6	
	Experience in projects in same region (4 points)	4	0		4	
	b) Professional registration	10	10		10	
b) Principal Project Team Leader - Electrical (20 points)	Experience in projects of similar nature	6	6		6	
	Experience in projects in same region (4 points)	4	0		4	
c) Project Team Member/Support – Mechanical (10 points)	c) Professional registration	5	0		0	

	Registered in-training	2.5					
	Experience in projects of similar nature	3			0	0	0
	Experience in projects in same region (2 points)	2			0	0	0
d) Project Team Member/Support -Electrical (10 points)	d)Professional registration	5				0	5
	Registered in-training	2.5				2.5	0
	Experience in projects of similar nature	3				3	3
	Experience in projects in same region (2 points)	2				0	2
(iv) Participation by nationals among proposed key staff			10				
a) Namibian staff	a) > 3 staff	10				10	10
	< 3 staff	5				5	
Total Points					65	72.5	85
Rank							

11. Section III. Financial Evaluation Report

After the Technical evaluation, the team proceeded to the financial proposals and evaluated the project consultant on the financial proposal submitted in accordance with the terms of reference.

The estimated budget prepared by Namibian Correctional Service for the magnitude of the assignment of 6 calendar months was not determined.

Consultant	Offer
1. <i>Dream Engineering Pty Ltd</i>	N\$ 242 575.25
2. <i>Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC</i>	N\$ 4804.67
3. <i>AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructure Managers Pty Ltd</i>	N\$ 68 908.00

The public entity observed major variance in amounts between the three bidders, which raised queries on which financial proposals are market related in relation to the scope of work outlined for the feasibility study. Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC, could not provide a clear breakdown of cost by activity in its financial proposal. Shield Force Consulting Engineers CC give a reason that their financial proposal is relatively general at this stage, and it will provide a breakdown of cost by activity once awarded a project with specific scope and TOR (Terms of Reference), it overlooked the proposed document provided to them (project Brief).

12. Best evaluated bid

- 12.1 The bid (Procurement Bid No **SC/RP/39-609/2024/2025** for the procurement to appoint a suitable professional Consultant (Electrical/Mechanical) to conduct feasibility study for the construction of Katima Mulilo Correctional Facility to the **Ministry of Home Affairs, Immigration, Safety and Security**) was examined and evaluated according to the criteria and methodology set out in the bidding documents which was compared with other bids to determine the lowest evaluated substantially responsive bid. The most substantially responsive bidder, AIJ Consulting Engineers and Infrastructure Managers (Pty) Ltd, Scored 85% on technical requirement to the amount of N\$ 68 908.00 (VAT Incl) to be considered for award.

