



Procurement Policy Unit

(Established under section 6 of the Public Procurement Act, 2015)

Ref: SC/RP/RFA-08/2018

STANDARD FORM

for

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

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

Ministry of Finance
Head Office (6th Floor, room 6.11)
Moltke Street
Private Bag 13295
Windhoek, Namibia

[Tel: +264 61 209 2463

|Fax: +264 61 230 179

|Website: www.mof.gov.na/procurement-policy-unit

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Project Title

Reference number of procurement

1. Scope of Contract: Consultancy Services for the Production of Animated Video
2. Procurement method used: Request for Proposal
3. Date of Invitation of Bids: Various dates in the Newspaper
4. Closing date for submission of Bids: 15th of February 2019
5. Date and place of opening of Bids: 15th of February 2019, 221 Feld Street, Road Fund Administration, 3rd Floor Boardroom
6. Number of bids received by closing date: 7
7. Responsiveness of bids: 0

Bidder' s Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive or not responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
N/A	-	-	Bids were not technically responsive, and therefore were not financially evaluated.

8. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive:

Name	A. Price at Bid Opening N\$	B. Bid Price after corrections	C. price after Adjustments N\$	D. Price after Margin of Preference <i>[If applicable]</i>	Rank
N/A	-	-	-	-	-

9. Best Evaluated Bid: Cancelled

REPORT ON EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION OF BIDS

The Procurement Committee

SUBJECT: REPORT ON EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION OF BIDS – RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL

Pursuant to the Section 26 of the Act, Evaluation Methodology and Criteria of the Bidding Document and Decision on the Appointment of the Ad Hoc Bid Evaluation Committee comprising of the following members:

#	Title	Name and Surname	Position / Title
1	Chairperson	STEPHANIE IZAAKS	Assistant Company Secretary / Legal Advisor
2	Member	ANNA MATEBELE	PO. Compliance Legal and Company Secretary
3	Member	PHILLEMONT EPHRAIM	Manager CBC and MDC
4	Member	TUHAFENI NEKONGO	HR Manager

The Members has completed the process of the examination and evaluation of bids for the following procurement procedure:

I) General Information

Procurement Reference Number:	
Procurement Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Goods
	<input type="checkbox"/> Works
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Consultancy Services
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultancy Services
Subject of Procurement:	Consultancy Services for the Production of Animated Video
Procurement Method:	Request for Proposal

Type of Contract:		Consulting Contract	
Contract Period	Estimated Start Date	1 April 2019	
	Estimated End Date	1 June 2019	
Estimated Value of the Contract		Below N\$ 2 million	
Contract Price Adjustment Provisions		n/a	
Date of Issue of Bidding Document:		15 January 2019	
Method of Advertisement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Newspaper	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Website	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: (Indicate)	

II) Timetable of Activities

The following Timetable applied to this procurement procedure:

#	Activity	Date	Time
1	Date of Publication of the Invitation to Bid	VARIOUS DATES	
2	Deadline for Written Questions/Clarifications	25 January 2019	15:30
3	Written Responses to Questions/Clarifications	TBA	TBA
4	Pre-Bid Conference/Site Visit	None	None
5	Modifications to Bidding Documents	None	None
6	Deadline for Submission of Bids	15 February 2019	14:00
7	Bid Opening Session	15 February 2019	14:30

III) Bid Opening Details

1	Number of Bids Received	Seven
---	-------------------------	-------

2	Number of Bids Withdrawn	None
3	Number of Bids Substituted	None
4	Number of Bids Modified	None
5	Number of Bids Evaluated	None

IV) Preliminary Evaluation Proceedings

i. Pre-Evaluation Preparatory Meeting

x : The Chairperson and the members of the Evaluation Committee reviewed Bidding Documents;

x : The Chairperson described the purpose and scope of the procurement procedure concerned, summarized the essential features of the bid procedure to date;

x : The Chairperson identified the person for preparation of Report on Examination and Evaluation of Bids and preparation of files on evaluated bids;

x : The Chairperson briefly explained examination and evaluation methodology and evaluation criteria determined in the Bidding Document;

- : All members of the Evaluation Committee have signed the Statement on Confidentiality and Non-Existence of Conflict of Interest;

x : The Chairperson confirmed that no member of the Evaluation Committee has a conflict of interest or is in any way associated with any of the Bidders submitting bids.

ii. List of bids that Entered Bid Examination and Evaluation Procedure

The Evaluation Committee only considered those bids which were found by the Bid Opening Panel to be suitable for further evaluation.

List of bids that entered bid evaluation procedure

No. of Bidder's Offer	Complete Name and Address of the Seat of the Bidder
1.	Juxtapose Design
2.	Inschiology Entertainment Studios
3.	Foster Digital Education Group CC
4.	Motiv88

5.	Advanced Business Consulting
6.	Intouch Interactive Marketing
7.	Countdown

iii. Evaluation of Legal, Professional, Technical, and Financial Admissibility of Bids

i. Legal Admissibility Evaluation Grid

The Evaluation Committee examined the bids to confirm that all documentary evidence establishing the Bidder's qualification requested in ITB Clause have been provided, and to determine whether bid comply with administrative requirements of the Bidding Document.

The Evaluation Committee used the following eligibility compliance grid to assess the compliance of each of the bids with the requirements stipulated in ITB Clause.

Eligibility Criteria	Foster Digital Education Group CC	Inschology Entertainment Studios	Juxtapose Design	Motiv88	Advanced Business Consulting	Intouch Interactive Marketing	Countdown Investments
Valid Good Standing Certificate: SSC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Valid Good Standing for Proposal Purpose	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
MoF: Inland Revenue VAT Reg. Certificate	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
AA Compliance Certificate/Exemption	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Founding Statement/ Certificate of Inc.	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Co. Profile & certified ID copies of owners/ shareholders/ members	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
ELIGIBILITY	QUALIFIED	QUALIFIED	QUALIFIED	DISQUALIFIED	DISQUALIFIED	DISQUALIFIED	DISQUALIFIED

The abovementioned table highlights which bidders did not submit the requested eligibility criteria set forth in the bidding documents evidence and have been deemed non-responsive. Therefore, they have been excluded from the further evaluation and comparison

After assessing submitted documentary evidence establishing the Bidder's technical compliance the Evaluation Committee concluded that all bids are non - compliant with the technical requirements set forth in the Bidding Document highlighting that bidders should score at least Only bids that scored at least 50 marks for the Technical Proposal or higher are considered technically responsive.

No. of Bidder's Offer	Complete Name and Address of the Seat of the Bidder	Explanation for Unqualified Bidder
1.	Juxtapose Design	Scored less than 50 out of 70 marks as required in the RFP
2.	Inschiology Entertainment Studios	Scored less than 50 out of 70 marks as required in the RFP
3.	Foster Digital Education Group CC	Scored less than 50 out of 70 marks as required in the RFP

iii. Financial Admissibility Evaluation

Based on the verification of the submitted evidence on bidder financial compliance, the Evaluation Committee has concluded that none of the bidders were evaluated based on their financial proposals due to non-compliance on the technical proposals and therefore was not considered for further evaluation.

VI) Clarification of Bids

The Evaluation Committee, pursuant to the Section 52(1) of Public Procurement Act, 2015 did not request any clarification of their bids.

VII) Evaluation and Comparison of Bids

The Evaluation Committee has continued its evaluation proceedings with bids that have been determined, up to this stage of the evaluation, not to be substantially responsive.

To evaluate a bid; the Evaluation Committee has only used methodologies and criteria set out in the Terms of Reference in terms of the Evaluation Methodology and Criteria.

i. Rectification of Nonconformities and Omissions in Bids

Due to no bidders being technically responsive, the Evaluation Committee did not request any bidders to submit any rectification or non-conformities or omissions in bids.

ii. Correction of Errors in Calculation

The Evaluation Committee has examined and verified all bids that have been deemed eligible to be evaluated technically. The Evaluation Committee confirms that the calculations are free

from error and no substantially responsive bids were found from the computation and summation.

iii. Final List of Bids for Evaluation and Comparison

According to the methodology defined in the Public Procurement Act under section 52(9),(13) and Directives the Public Entity shall select the successful bid by applying the following method:

- A. The all bids that is found to be substantially non - responsive to the professional, technical evaluation, and was not considered for the financial qualification requirements.
- B. The bid that is found to be substantially responsive to the professional, technical, and financial qualification requirements, technically compliant in relation to the technical specifications, and with the lowest evaluated bid The lowest evaluated bid shall be the bid offering better economic advantage ascertained on the basis of factors affecting the economic value of the bid.

B. Determining the Bid Offering the Best Economic Advantage¹

Since none of the bidders met all the mandatory legal, professional, technical, and especially financial requirements due to not being technically compliant Bids, bidders were not further evaluated and scored using the two-stage bid evaluation and scoring method.

In accordance with ITB Clause , the Public Entity's evaluation of the Bid will take into account, in addition to the bid price, the following additional evaluation criteria in order of their importance and their proportional weight in the total system of evaluation, the procedure of determining the bid offering the best economic advantage has been conducted as follows:

1. The evaluation procedure has been conducted exclusively based on available information specified in the submitted bid package;

- a. The Evaluation Committee has determined weighting factor that indicates their level of importance, as follows:

¹ Proposed criteria and weightings are for explanatory purposes only.

Priority	Name of criteria	Proportional value in points
1	Completeness, neatness, logical flow of proposal	5
2	Creativity and Ideas	5
3	The Company Overview	5
4	Expertise of the team that will be serving the RFA	15
5	Client References	10
6	Proposal approach and execution plan	20
7	Sample DVD's	5
8	Black Economic Empowerment	5
I	Total Additional Criteria (1+2+3+4)	70
II	Bid Price (Column 8)	30
III	Sum Total (I+II)	100

b. The Evaluation Committee has evaluated any additional criteria using the following scoring scale from 0 to 10:

SCORING		DESCRIPTION
81-100	Excellent	Exceeds the requirements of the criteria significantly and in beneficial ways/very desirable
61-80	Good	Fully meets the requirement of the criteria
41-60	Fair	Adequately meets most of the requirements of the criteria. May be lacking in some areas that are not critical.
21-40	Poor	Addresses all of the requirements of the criterion to the minimum acceptable level.
0-20	Very Poor	Minimally addresses some, but not all, of the requirements of the criteria or lacking in critical areas.
0	Unsatisfactory	Does not satisfy the requirements of the criteria in any manner.

Scores are applied to each of the additional criteria and are multiplied by the weight factor to arrive at the final score.

c. The total score for the Bid has been determined through this method and has been the basis for ranking Bids.

3. The Evaluation Committee has applied the following technical additional criteria and weightings in evaluation process:

Item No:	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points
1.	Completeness, neatness, logical flow of proposal Completeness, neatness, logical flow of proposal.	5
2.	Creativity and Ideas The Consultant must: (a) provide a draft concept development document (b) demonstrate creative thinking and overall presentation of the script, drawing boards and illustrations.	5
3.	The Company Overview The Consultant must: (a) provide overview of the company, including their corporate profile and overall business objectives. (b) demonstrate the company's experience and expertise in the field of Video Production Services.	5
4.	Expertise of the team that will be serving the RFA The Consultant must: (a) provide an outline of the production crew that will be engaged in the production of the animated video. (b) submit academic qualification and/or experience of individuals that will be involved in the various related assignments and stipulate the involvement of each.	15
5.	Client References The Consultant must submit at least 3 client references for a similar production.	10

6. **Proposal approach and execution plan** 20
The Consultant must submit a high-level project plan with the ability to demonstrate thorough understanding of the Video Production Services which will be provided to the RFA.
7. **Sample DVD's** 5
The Consultant must submit 3x animated short videos of previous successful production jobs on a DVD to be submitted with the Technical Proposal. Each video must be no longer than 5-15 minutes each.
9. **Black Economic Empowerment** 5
(a) It is the RFA's objective, subject to section 2 (b) (ee) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015, to promote participation of previously disadvantaged persons through its panel of Consultant.
(b) Bidders must submit proof of a team that includes designated groups as defined in the Affirmative Action (Employment) Act, 1998.

Total for Technical Proposal (i.e. Technical Scores/TS)	70
Total Bid Price	30
SUM TOTAL	100

a. Individual weighted scores for all technical criteria have been weighted according to the set proportional weighting factors. The weighted result has been calculated by multiplying the score by the proportional weighting factor of the individual criterion.





b. The financial evaluation was not considered or opened due to all bids being technically non-responsive.

VIII) Conclusion


The Evaluation Committee recommends that the RFA, cancel the bidding process in terms of Section 54(1) (a) of the Public Procurement Act in that, 'all the bids are non-responsive'.

X) Certification of the Report

iv. Signatures of Members of the Evaluation Committee

#	Bid Opening Panel	Name and Surname	Signature
1	Chairperson	Stephanie Izaaks	
2	Member	Anna Matebele	
3	Member	Phillemon Ephraim	
4.	Member	Tuhafeni Nekongo	

ix. Report prepared by:

Name and Surname	Signature	Date
Stephanie Izaaks		17 May 2019
Attachments: As in text		