



Ref: G/OIB/NPWR-01/2023

STANDARD FORM

for

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

[Issued in terms of section 7(1)(i) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015]

**Namibia Power Corporation (PTY) Ltd
NamPower Centre
15 Luther Street
PO Box 2864
Windhoek, Namibia**

[Tel: +264 61 205 4111

[Fax: +264 61 232 805

Email address: bidclarifications@nampower.com.na

[Website: www.nampower.com.na

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Project Title

Reference number of procurement: G/OIB/NPWR-01/2023

1. **Scope of Contract:** Supply and Delivery of Flicker Conductor for Kuiseb-Sekelduin 132kV Tx Lines
2. **Procurement method:** Open International Bidding
3. **Date of Invitation of Bids:** 22 July 2022
4. **Closing date for submission of bids:** 16 September 2022
5. **Date and place of opening of bids:** 16 September 2022, Omusati Boardroom
6. **Number of bids received by closing date:** 13
7. **Responsiveness of bids:**

Bidder' s Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive or not responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
Advanced Pro Technology & Investment CC	N\$25,461,000.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Did not submit a quotation letter indicating the bid validity of 90 days.- Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document.- The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules.- The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification.- Test certificates provided were of a very different and much larger conductor from the required Flicker conductor.- Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and not from bidder itself.- The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder

			<p>itself has testing capabilities for the conductor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bidder did not submit the Bidder's Experience form but provided an OEM's experience instead. - Bidder did not provide any reference letters from previous clients.
Yifang electric Group Inc. / A & P Engineering CC	N\$18,273,600.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not submit a quotation letter indicating the bid validity of 90 days - Bid securing declaration completed by A&P Engineering, the bidder's agent and not by the bidder - Labour Act, written undertaking form completed by bidder's agent (A&P Engineering) and not by bidder - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that the agent (A & P Engineering) is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - Did not prove a delivery schedule/program - Did not submit proof of ISO certification - Provided test certificates of a very different (much larger) conductor than Flicker - Did not provide testing capabilities for the conductor - Did not submit 3 years financial statements; provided for two years only (2019 & 2020) - Reference letters were for distribution cables and not for Flicker or similar ASCR conductor
Amalinda Trading CC & Omuthiya Technologies CC JV	N\$27,658,322.10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an

			<p>OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification - Provided test certificates of a very different (much larger) conductor than Flicker Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and bidder itself. - The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor - Only one partner (Omuthiya) the JV complied with latest 3 years financial statements. The other partner (Amalinda) submitted only 1 year's (2021) financial statements.
Apar Industries Limited	USD846720+NS378540	Yes	-
Central Technical Supplies (PTY) Ltd	N\$17,364,780.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules. - Bidder did not provide a delivery schedule/program - Bidder did not submit its ISO certification - Bidder did not submit any type test certificates for Flicker or similar conductor - Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and not from bidder itself. - Did not provide testing capabilities for the conductor

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only provided the latest two (2) years financially statements instead for three (3) as required by the bid document. - Did not complete and provide a Bidder's experience form. - Did not provide references of three (3) past clients.
Faradayz Investments CC	N\$18,277,423.20	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules. - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification. - Bidder provided test certificates from an OEM of a very different (larger) conductor from Flicker. - Bidder did not submit a form of technical warranty. - The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor. - Bidder did not submit the Bidder's Experience form but provided an OEM's experience instead. - Provided only one reference client, to which they supplied goods unrelated to bid scope requirements (ASCR conductor).
First Polymer Traders Namibia Pty Ltd	N\$13,485,393.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not submit a quotation letter indicating the bid validity of 90 days. - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the

			<p>OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not submit completed and signed technical schedules for the conductor. - Did not submit a delivery schedule/program. - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification. - Did not submit test certificates of the conductor. - Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and not from- bidder itself. - The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor. - Provided reference clients to which they supplied LV, MV and PVC cables (unrelated to bid scope requirements).
Middal Cables International Limitada	N\$16,265,437.20	Yes	-
Namibia Freshness CC	N\$19,823,795.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules. - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification. - Provided test certificates from an OEM but not the bidder itself.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and bidder itself. - The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor. - Bidder submitted an OEM's experience and not that of the bidder. - Bidder provided an OEM's client references and not that of the bidder.
People's Cable Group Co. Ltd.	N\$12,827,700	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provided test certificates of a different (much larger) conductor than flicker. - Technical warranty submitted does not mention 12 months warranty and is thus not in accordance with clause 28.3 of the GCC as specified in the bid document.
Royal Empire Investment CC & Henan Homan Cable Co. Ltd JV	N\$19,950,000.30	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not submit a quotation letter indicating the bid validity of 90 days. - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules. - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification. - Provided test certificates from an OEM for a much larger conductor, different from Flicker but not the bidder itself. - Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and bidder itself. The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder

			<p>itself has testing capabilities for the conductor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did not submit the latest three (3) years financial statements. Bidder submitted an OEM's experience and not that of the bidder. - Did not provide reference letters from past clients.
Senal Trading CC	N\$23,000,085.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document. - The bidder provided completed signed technical schedules from an OEM but the bidder itself did not provide evidence of complying with the required technical schedules. - The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification. - Provided test certificates from an OEM of a different (much larger) conductor than flicker. - Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and bidder itself. - The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor. Submitted only the last two (2) years financial statements and three (3) as required by the bid document. - Bidder submitted an OEM's experience and not that of the bidder. - Did not provide reference letters from past clients.
Senko Investment CC	N\$16,200,000.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although bidder provided a manufacturer's authorization, the bidder failed to submit proof that bidder is a branch/subsidiary of the OEM as the bid is reserved for OEMs and its branches and

			<p>subsidiaries as per ITB 20.1 (a) of bidding document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Did not provide a delivery schedule/program.- The bidder provided ISO certification of an OEM but bidder itself did not provide evidence of ISO certification.- Provided test certificates from an OEM but not from the bidder itself- Bidder submitted form of technical warranty from an OEM and bidder itself.- The bidder provided testing capabilities of an OEM but failed to provide evidence that the bidder itself has testing capabilities for the conductor.- The Bidder submitted an OEM's experience and not that of the bidder.- The Bidder provided an OEM's client references and not that of the bidder.
--	--	--	--

8. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive: 2

Name	A. Price at Bid Opening N\$	B. Bid Price after corrections including contingencies	C. price after Adjustments N\$	D. Price after Margin of Preference [<i>If applicable</i>]	Rank
Apar Industries Limited	USD846,720+NS\$378540 N\$15,018,328.80				1
Midal Cables International Ltd	N\$16,265,437.20				2

9. Best Evaluated Bid: **Apar Industries Limited.**