



Procurement Policy Unit

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

Ref: NCS/RFQ/RFA – 04/2019

STANDARD FORM

for

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

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

Road Fund Administration 21 Feld Street, Windhoek
Private Bag 13372 Ausspannplatz, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: +264 61 433 3046 Fax: +264 61 433 3070
E-mail: bgarises@rfanam.com.na
Website: www.rfanam.com.na

Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Project Title: Provision of Printing Services for the Road Fund Administration

Reference number of procurement: NCS/RFQ/RFA – 04/2019

1. **Scope of Contract:** Provision of Printing Services for the Road Fund Administration
2. **Procurement method used:** Request for Quotations
3. **Date of Invitation of Bids:** Various dates in the Newspaper and on the RFA Website
4. **Closing date for submission of bids:** 28 June 2019
5. **Date and place of opening of bids:** 28 June 2019, RFA Head Office, 21 Feld Street, 3rd Floor Boardroom
6. **Number of bids received by closing date:** 11
7. **Responsiveness of bids:** 3

Bidder' s Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive or not responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
SWACO Industries Namibia	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Star Printing Press	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Creative Concepts	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Solitaire Press	548,720.01	Yes	
Glonam Trading Enterprises	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Unique Printing and Supplies	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Pont Marketing and Press	N/A	No	No valid good Standing Tax Certificate
Salient Investment cc	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Independent Investment	N/A	No	Technically not responsive
Universal Print	742,040.95	Yes	
Goldenberries Investments	519,768.95	Yes	

8. Technical Evaluation Scores

Only three bidders obtained the required technical score (70% of 50) and therefore considered for the financial Evaluation.

The scores of the technical evaluation and ranking are indicated in the table below.

No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Score	Ranking
1.	Solitaire Press	41.17	1
2.	Universal Print	35.67	3
3.	Goldenberries Investments	40.83	2

9. Financial Evaluation

9.1.1 Financial Evaluation Criteria

The financial proposal weighed **50 points** or 50% of the total achievable points and was evaluated based on the following formula:

$$P_s = \left(\frac{PL}{PN}\right) * 50$$

P_s = Price score awarded to the financial proposal under consideration.

PL = The tender price of the lowest financial proposal opened.

PN = The tender price of the financial proposal under consideration.

The bid was split in two samples for possible partial award. The pricing was split similarly for the same reason.

Where:

Sample 1: Includes all print items that require security features and sequential numbering. No partial award will be considered. The Bidder having submitted the lowest evaluated responsive quotation and qualified to perform the service shall be selected for award of contract.

Sample 2: Includes general printing and open for partial award. The Bidder having submitted the lowest evaluated responsive quotation and qualified to perform the service shall be selected for award of contract.

Sample 1

The financial evaluation was done for the bidders whose quotes were complete. Goldenberries did not quote for CBC Permits, therefore not included in the financial evaluation for sample 1.

The table below indicates the **Bid Price, Financial Evaluation Score** (as per the above mentioned formula) and **Ranking** for **Sample 1**. The prices are inclusive of VAT.

Financial Evaluation: Sample 1

No.	Name of Bidder	Bid Price	Financial evaluation	Ranking
1.	Solitaire Press	485, 663.40	50	1
2.	Universal Print	495, 493.60	49.01	2

Financial Evaluation: Sample 2

The table below indicates the **Bid Price, Financial Evaluation Score** (as per the above mentioned formula) and **Ranking** for **Sample 2**. The prices are inclusive of VAT.

No.	Name of Bidder	Bid Price	Financial evaluation	Ranking
1.	Solitaire Press	63,086.70	50	1
2.	Universal Print	246,547.35	12.79	3
3.	Goldenberries Investments	80,781.75	39.05	2

10. Summary of Technical and Financial Evaluation and Ranking

The following table shows the summary of the technical and financial evaluation and ranking for:

Sample 1.

No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Score	Financial Score	Final Score out of 100	Ranking
1.	Solitaire Press	41.17	50	91.17	1
2.	Universal Print	35.67	49.01	84.67	2

Solitaire Press obtained a final score of 91.17 in Sample 1 and is ranked at the first (1st). place.

The following table shows the summary of the technical and financial evaluation and ranking for:

Sample 2.

No.	Name of Bidder	Technical Score	Financial Score	Final Score out of 100	Ranking
1.	Solitaire Press	41.17	50	91.17	1

2.	Universal Print	35.67	12.79	48.46	3
3.	Goldenberries Investments	40.83	39.05	79.88	2

Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive: **Sample 1**

Name	A. Price at Bid Opening N\$	B. Bid Price after corrections	C. price after Adjustments N\$	D. Price after Margin of Preference [If applicable]	Rank
Solitaire Press	485, 663.40	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Universal Print	495, 493.60	N/A	N/A	N/A	2

Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive: **Sample 2**

Name	A. Price at Bid Opening N\$	B. Bid Price after corrections	C. price after Adjustments N\$	D. Price after Margin of Preference [If applicable]	Rank
Solitaire Press	63,086.70	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Universal Print	246,547.35	N/A	N/A	N/A	3
Goldenberries Investments	80,781.75	N/A	N/A	N/A	2

11. Best Evaluated Bid:

Sample 1

Solitaire Press obtained a final score of 91.17 in Sample 1 and is ranked at the first (1st). place. Solitaire Press is technically and financially responsive; therefore, recommended for this service.

Sample 2

Solitaire Press obtained a final score of 91.17 in Sample 2 and is ranked at the first (1st) place. Solitaire Press is technically and financially responsive; therefore, recommended for this service.