



Executive Summary of Bid Evaluation Report

Project Title: PROVISION OF CLEANING SERVICES FOR A PERIOD OF 36 MONTHS AT THE PORT OF WALVIS BAY

Procurement Reference Number: NCS/ONB/NAMPORT/3663/2025

1. Scope of Contract: PROVISION OF CLEANING SERVICES FOR A PERIOD OF 36 MONTHS AT THE PORT OF WALVIS BAY
2. Procurement method used: Open National Bidding (ONB)
3. Date of Invitation of Bids: 18 June 2025
4. Closing date for submission of bids: 31 July 2025 @12h00 PM
5. Date and place of opening of bids: 31 July 2025, Namport Procurement Boardroom 12h10 PM
6. Number of bids received by closing date: Thirty- Six (36)
7. Responsiveness of bids:

Bidder's Name	Pricing at Bid Opening N\$	Responsive or Not Responsive (Yes/ No)	Reasons Why Bid is Not Responsive
1.JMG Investments CC	N\$ 7 254 050.03	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
2.STS Mega Investment CC	N\$ 9 155 702.00	Yes	
3.Florida Trading CC	N\$ 10 571 859.20	Yes	
4. Welwitschia Catering & Cleaning Services	N\$ 11 093 817.03	Yes	
5. Imminent Growth Investments CC	N\$ 9 641 314.80	Yes	
6.Rika Investments CC	N\$ 8 256 964.10	No	The bidder failed to submit any audited or externally reviewed financial statements, contrary to ITB 5.6(d), which requires three years of audited/externally reviewed AFS to demonstrate financial soundness. This omission constitutes a complete failure of financial compliance.
7.Deluxe Cleaning Services	N\$ 7 356 526.36	No	The financial statements submitted were neither signed nor accompanied by the auditor's practice



			number, making the audit status unverifiable. This does not meet the authenticity and verification requirements of ITB 5.6(d) and therefore fails financial compliance.
8.Vidu Trading CC	N\$ 10 678 084.70	Yes	
9.Lypa Investments CC	N\$ 8 013 673.80	No	The bidder submitted only two financial years instead of the required three years as stipulated in ITB 5.6(d). The missing year results in incomplete evidence of financial performance.
10.Gemztone Trading CC	N\$ 8 850 382.70	Yes	
11.Nova Investments CC	N\$ 10 093 164.75	Yes	
12.Nghandiza Investment CC	N\$ 10 617 871.80	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
13. Green Side Trading Enterprises CC	N\$ 9 339 168.40	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
14.Swarkoppies Investments CC	N\$ 12 500 444.80	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
15.Tempo NTN Trading CC	N\$ 6 414 172.72	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the



			Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
16.Baywash Cleaning Services CC	N\$ 14 176 698.12	No	The bidder did not provide the full three-year set of financial statements required under ITB 5.6(d), resulting in non-compliance.
17.Hache Investment CC	N\$ 7 066 200. 30	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
18.Atlantic Hygiene Solutions	N\$ 10 161 568.00	No	Only two years of AFS were provided, contrary to the three-year requirement in ITB 5.6(d). The omission prevents full assessment of financial stability.
19.Ma-Nic Investment CC	N\$ 6 902 469.72	No	The bidder did not state any bid validity period on the Bid Submission Form, contrary to ITB 16.1, which requires a minimum validity period of 180 working days. Absence of bid validity constitutes a material deviation under ITB 27, as it affects the enforceability of the bid.
20.Roha Investment CC	7 774 170.20	No	The bidder submitted unaudited financial statements, contrary to ITB 5.6(d), which requires statements to be audited (for Pty Ltd) or externally reviewed (for CCs). The financial status cannot be reliably verified.
21.Narirongo Investment CC	N\$ 8 214 450.00	No	The bidder did not provide any financial statements, failing entirely to meet the financial capacity requirement under ITB 5.6(d).
22.Noria Trading CC	N\$ 11 831 397.80	No	Only two years of financial statements were submitted instead of the required three. This does not satisfy the financial capacity requirement under ITB 5.6(d).
23.Jensen Investment CC	N\$ 12 127 023.31 (VAT Exclusive)	No	Although the Bid Submission Form and Bid Securing Declaration were signed and stamped, the bidder did not sign or initial the remainder of the bidding document, contrary to ITB Clause 19, which requires all pages to be authenticated by an authorised representative. This omission constitutes a deviation



				from the mandatory requirements of ITB Clause 13.1 and ITB Clause 19, resulting in the bid being deemed non-responsive, as the Public Entity cannot verify the bidder's legal commitment to the full terms of the bidding document.
24. Uncle Rich Investment CC	N\$ 7 466 699.00 (VAT Exclusive)	No		The bidder indicated a bid validity period of 90 days, which does not comply with the prescribed minimum of 180 working days under ITB 16.1. A bid submitted with insufficient validity cannot be accepted and is deemed non-responsive.
25. Esh'Ockra Investment CC	N\$ 15 996 955.40	No		The bidder did not sign or initial the full bidding document as required under ITB Clause 19, despite signing the Bid Submission Form, Bid Securing Declaration, and indicating a 180-day validity period. This omission violates the mandatory requirements of ITB Clauses 13.1 and 19, resulting in the bid being deemed non-responsive.
26. Menelik Trading CC	N\$ 8 435 912.34	No		A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
27. Mudjanima Investment CC	N\$ 8 660 800.00	No		A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
28. Wallet Doctor Investments CC	N\$ 8 445 663.85	No		The bidder did not submit a valid letter of credit or credible letter of intent as required under ITB 5.6(d). Additionally, the financial statements lacked audit stamps/signatures, rendering the audit status unverifiable. These deficiencies constitute material non-compliance.
29. Eba Sino Investment CC	N\$ 7 567 070.79	No		The bidder indicated a bid validity period of 90 days, which does not comply with ITB Clause 14.1,



			<p>requiring bids to remain valid for 180 days as specified in the Bidding Document.</p> <p>This constitutes a material deviation from the mandatory administrative requirements and renders the bid non-responsive under ITB Clauses 14.1 and 27.</p>
30.Innotino Investment CC	N\$ 16 002 186.75	No	The bidder did not provide any financial statements, failing entirely to meet the financial capacity requirement under ITB 5.6(d).
31.PTN Trading CC	N\$ 6 541 821.00	No	A bid that fails to achieve the minimum technical score of 70%, as prescribed under Section III: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria, constitutes a material deviation from the requirements of the Bidding Document and is therefore declared non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27 (Examination of Bids and Determination of Responsiveness). As such, the bid does not proceed with further evaluation.
32.Twin Horizon CC	N\$ 25 175 582.00	No	No bid validity period was indicated on the Bid Submission Form, in violation of ITB Clause 14.1, which requires bidders to state the period during which their bid shall remain valid. Failure to indicate the bid validity constitutes a material omission and renders the bid non-responsive in accordance with ITB Clause 27 (Determination of Responsiveness).
33.Cage Contractor, Cleaning & Catering CC	N\$ 7 077 220.15	No	The bidder indicated a 90-day validity period instead of the required 180 days, contrary to ITB Clause 14.1, and submitted an incomplete Bid Securing Declaration that was not signed or dated, in violation of ITB Clause 17.1. These material deviations render the bid non-responsive in terms of ITB Clause 27.
34.Amtshila Investment CC	N\$ 9 756 988.10	No	Submission includes only two years instead of the required three, resulting in incomplete financial documentation under ITB 5.6(d).
35.Ondiyala Investment CC	N\$ 7 108 646.62	No	A 90-day bid validity period was indicated instead of the required 180 days on the Bid Submission Form, contrary to ITB Clause 14.1. In addition, the Bid Securing Declaration was incomplete, as it was not signed or stamped, in violation of ITB Clause 17.1. These deviations constitute material non-compliance and render the bid non-responsive under ITB Clause 27.
36.Mono Trading CC	N\$ 8 361 557.68	Yes	



8. Price comparison for bids that are substantially responsive:

Bidder no	Bidder	Bid Price (from lowest to highest)	Technical Responsiveness	Margin of Preference	Evaluated Price	Ranking
36.	Mono Trading	N\$ 8,361,557.68	96%	7%	7,776,248.6	1
10.	Gemztone Trading	N\$ 8,850,382.70	78%	7%	8,230,855.91	2
2.	STS Mega Investments	N\$ 9,155,702.00	86%	7%	8,514,802.86	3
5.	Imminent Growth Investments CC	N\$ 9,641,314.80	77%	7%	8,966,422.76	4
11.	Nova Investments	N\$ 10,093,164.75	88%	7%	9,386,643.22	5
3.	Florida Trading	N\$ 10,571,859.20	82%	5%	10,043,266.24	6
7.	Vidu Trading	N\$ 10,678,084.70	77%	5%	10,144,180.46	7
4.	Welwitschia Catering and Cleaning Services	N\$ 11,093,817.03	92%	1%	10,982,878.86	8

9. Best Evaluated Bid:

Based on the outcome of the administrative, technical, and financial evaluations conducted in accordance with ITB Clauses 27 and 33, the Evaluation Committee confirms that the recommended bidder has demonstrated full compliance with all mandatory requirements and has achieved the status of substantially responsive. The Evaluation Committee therefore recommends the award of the contract to Mono Trading CC for the total amount of N\$ 8,361,557.68 (VAT Inclusive) for the provision of cleaning services for a period of thirty-six (36) months.

Chairperson: Bid Evaluation Committee

Date: 15/04/2026