

REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA  
OHANGWENA REGIONAL COUNCIL  
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT UNIT

Section DEAC  
Tel: 065 290283  
Fax: 065 290224  
Enquiries: Emma N Nakulwa  
Email: emmandahambelelela@gmail.com

Harelbecke Street, Greenwell Complex Building  
Private bag 88005  
Eenhana

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE BIDS REPORT**

**Project Title:** Supply and deliver materials for the In-Service Training for the Pre-Vocational and Technical Teachers in Ohangwena Region  
(Procurement Reference No: G/RFQ/OHRC10-26/2022/2023)

1. Scope of Contract: Goods
2. Procurement method used: Request for Sealed Quotation and Informal Quotation
3. Date of Invitation of Bids: 05 September 2022
4. Closing date for submission of bids: 09 September 2022 at 10h00
5. Date and place of opening of bids: 09 September 2022 at DEAC
6. Number of bids received by closing date:
 

Lot A:	3
Lot B:	1
Quoted for all Lots:	2
7. Responsiveness of bids;

**LOT A**

No.	Bidder's name	Bid Amount (N\$)	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
1.	Archee Investment cc	19 497.20	Yes	Responsive
2.	Wakama Trading Enterprises cc	30 820.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
3.	Deme Investment cc	34 951.49	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
The best evaluated bid for Lot A is Archee Investment cc.				

**LOT B**

No.	Bidder's name	Bid Amount (N\$)	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
1.	Shikulumbwati Investment cc	26 720.00	Yes	Responsive
The best evaluated bid for Lot A is Shikulumbwati Investment cc.				

### Quoted for all Lots

No.	Bidder's name	Lots	Bid Amount (N\$)	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
1.	So-Ha Investment cc	A	71 524.00	No	The bidder selected all the Lots.
		B	10 701.00		
	Prince-Tanga Trading cc	A	71 548.00	No	The bidder selected all the Lots.
		B	10 702.00		


**Project Title:** Supply and delivery of the refreshment items for the Directors' Office for the Directorate of Education, Arts and Culture  
**(Procurement Reference No: G/RFQ/OHRC10-07/2022/2023)**

No.	Bidder's name	Bid Amount (N\$)	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
1.	Archee Investment cc	4 847.25	No	The Bid is substantially below the market prices.
2.	Adrimag Investment cc	10 364.81	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 3 instead of 60 days.
3.	Rockwall Supplies cc	9 602.38	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 30 instead of 60 days.
4.	La - Kera Investment cc	11 791.71	Yes	Responsive
5.	Wakama Trading Enterprises cc	12 069.25	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
6.	Poalos Investment cc	10 647.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder, (cost value before VAT)
7.	Abel Dumeni Trading cc	11 962.00	No	The Tax Good Standing Certificate is expired.
8.	Deme Investment cc	13 870.84	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
9.	Alukana Investment cc	13 988.27	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
10.	Ekorolyetu Investment cc	14 478.16	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
11.	TS Kayone Trading Enterprises cc	12 790.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
12.	Parmenas Investments cc	12 911.40	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 90 instead of 60 days.
13.	So-Ha Investment cc	13 004.00	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 90 instead of 60 days.
14.	Washa - Washa Investments cc	13 005.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
15.	Prince-Tanga Trading cc	13 019.00	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 15 instead of 60 days.

16.	Prince-Tanga Trading cc	13 124.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
17.	Nana Catering and Décor Services cc	13 855.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
<b>The best evaluated Bid is La - Kera Investment cc.</b>				

**Project Title:** Supply and delivery of the refreshment items for the VIP lunch during the launching of the Heritage Week Celebration  
(Procurement Reference No: G/Rfq/OHRC10-08/2022/2023)

No.	Bidder's name	Bid Amount (N\$)	Responsive (Yes/No)	Reasons why bid is not responsive
1.	Dexin Investment and Properties cc	3 600.00	No	The Bid is substantially below the market prices.
2.	Adrimag Investment cc	5 258.95	No	The Quotation validity period provided differs with the requested period, 60 vs 90 instead of 60 days.
3.	Wanangonya General Trading cc	4 580.00	No	Page 8 is not sealed.
4.	Abel Dumeni Trading cc	5 000.00	Yes	Responsive
5.	Efindano Catering and Cleaning Services cc	5 819.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
6.	Gwaayimene Investments cc	5 120.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
7.	Efolo and Son Investment cc	7 084.00	No	The Good Standing Tax Certificate is expired.
8.	Nana Catering and Décor Services cc	7 080.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
9.	Napopye Trading cc	7 300.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
10.	Washa - Washa Investments cc	8 360.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
11.	Tosheipo Investments cc	8 240.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
12.	Deme Investment cc	10 741.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
13.	So-Ha Investment cc	13 200.00	No	The bid is higher than the lowest evaluated responsive bidder.
<b>The best evaluated Bid is Abel Dumeni Trading cc.</b>				

  
FILLIPUS H SHILONGO  
ACCOUNTING OFFICER

