

Republic of Malawi

BALAKA DISTRICT

GOVERNANCE TO ENABLE SERVICE DELIVERY
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**PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NUMBER:**

**CONSTRUCTION OF VARIOUS STRUCTIURES IN BALAKA DISTRICT**

#### EVALUATION REPORT

##### 28th October, 2021

# INVITATION FOR QUOTATIONS

The RFQs were issued on 13th October, 2021nand Contractors were supposed to submit their sealed quotations in the tender box by 2:30 hrs on 19th October, 2021. The quotations were issued to potential contractors shortlisted using the company profiles. However, since the RFQs were also uploaded on the PPDA website, others downloaded from the website.

The following submitted their quotations:

**Table 1: list of contractors who submitted their quotation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **BIDDER** | **ADRRESS** |
| 1 | MASUKU CONSTRUCTION | P.O BOX 40 NAMWERA |
| 2 | MATHEWS PHIRI CIVIL ENGINEERING CONTRACTOR | P.O.BOX 314 ZOMBA |
| 3 | ETTAMA BUILDING AND CIVIL CONTRACTORS | P.O.BOX 108 LIWONDE |
| 4 | GREATLINE CONSTRUCTION | P.O.BOX 2528 BLANTYRE |
| 5 | MWAKA CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTOR | P.O.BOX 345, MANGOCHI |
| 6 | WESFERRY BUILDING CONTRACTO | P.O.BOX 2133, LILONGWE |
| 7 | MALES ARTISAN | P.O.BOX 1686, BLANTYRE |
| 8 | HECHI CONSTRUCTION | P.O.BOX 30393,LILONGWE |
| 9 | MOPROM CONSTRUCTION | P.O.BOX30922, LILONGWE |
| 10 | ANINGO CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTORS | P.O.BOX 2130, BLANTYRE |
| 11 | FT AND L GENERAL WORKS | P.O.BOX 413 BALAKA |
| 12 | MOBILE BUILDING AND CIVIL CONTRACTORS | P.O.BOX 31273, LILONGWE |
| 13 | PATSONS CONSTRUTION | P.O.BOX 32, CHILEKA |
| 14 | MAZIKO CONSTRUCTION | P.O.BOX 200, LIWONDE |
| 15 | MANDE CONSTRUCTION | P.O .BOX 31284,BALAKA |
| 16 | AKUNO-KUSA CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTORS | P.O.BOX 6, BALAKA |
| 17 | MANA CONSTRUCTION | P.O.BOX 77 ZOMBA |

# EVALUATION TEAM

Upon recommendation and approval from the IPDC, the evaluation team was as follows:

**Table 2: Names of members of the evaluation team**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **NAME** | **POSITION IN THE EVALUATION OMMITTEE** | **DESIGNATION** |
| **1** | Peter Chiumbuzo | Chairman | NGLFC liaison officer - Secretariat |
| **2** | Christipher Kandiwo | Secretary | Assistant Procurement Officer - Secretariat |
| **3** | Benjamin Makoto | Member | Assistant Director of Finance - Secretariat |
| **4** | Amith Genala | Member | Human Resource Management Officer - Education |
| **5** | Emmanuel Matola | Member | Human Resource Management Officer - Education |
| **6** | Patrick Kachenga | Member | Procurement Assistant - secretariat |
| **7** | Davie Konondo | Member | Acting M&E Officer |

The evaluation process was facilitated by the Procurement Unit represented by: Christopher Kandiwo – Assistant Procurement Officer. With an apology from Davie Konondo who was engaged with by-election during the same period.

**BID OPENING**

The Quotations were opened on 28th - 29th October, 2021 at Mawira Lodge by the members of the Evaluation Team and the overall prices quoted by the firms were read out and recorded.

Table 3: **Results of the bid/quotation opening**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **BIDDER NAME/COMPANY** | **READ OUT AMOUNT (MK)** |
| **Lot 1** | **CONSTRUCTION OF CHIMATIRO MATERNITY WING** |  |
| 1a | MASIKU CONSTRUCTION | 64,141,312.65 |
| 2a | MATHEWS PHIRI CIVIL ENGINEERING CONTRACTOR | 47,643,796.57 |
| 3a | ETTAMA BUILDING AND CIVIL CONTRACTORS | 75,394,677.00 |
| 4a | GREATLINE CONSTRUCTION | 63,416,815.00 |
| **Lot 2** | **CONSTRUCTION OF LIVIRIVI EPA OFFICE BLOCK** |  |
| 1b | MWAKA CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTOR | 33,935,379.19 |
| 2b | WESFERRY BUILDING CONTRACTO | 47,834,890.26 |
| 3b | MALES ARTISAN CONSTRUCTION | 84,333,933.51 |
| 4b | GREATLINE LINE CONSTRUCTION, | 72,799,764.00 |
| **Lot3:** | **CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL SHOPS IN BALAKA BUS DEPOT** |  |
| 1c | HECHI CONSTRUCTION | 21,842,571.75 |
| 2c | MOPROM CONSTRUCTION | 21,219,084.00 |
| 3c | ANINGO CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTORS | 36,377,604.00 |
| 4c | FT AND L GENERAL WORKS | 38,228.574.00 |
| **Lot 4** | **CONSTRUCTION OF MBERA RESOUCE CENTRE** |  |
| 1e | MANDE CONSTRUCTION | 79,562,749.00 |
| 2e | GREAT LINE CONSTRUCTION | 71,486,619.28 |
| 3e | MAZIKO CONSTRUCTION | 75 ,241,841.25 |
| 4e | PATSONS CONSTRUTION | 59,008,023.00 |
| **Lot 5** | **CONSTRUCTION OF KACHENGA MARKET SHED** |  |
| 1d | ANINGO CIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTORS | 20,874,012.00 |
| 2d | MOBILE BUILDING AND CIVIL CONTRACTORS | 19,372,498.50 |
| 3d | MOPROM CONSTRUCTION | 11,549,602.50 |
| 4d | HECHI CONSTRUCTION | 16,044,189.00 |
| **Lot 6** | **CONSTRUCTION OF CHIDZANJA MARKET SLOUGHTERE HOUSE** |  |
| 1f | MOPRON CONSTRUCTION | 13,905,119.65 |
| 2f | MANA CONSTRUCTION | 18,709,965.00 |
| 3f | AKUNO-KUSA CIIVIL AND BUILDING CONTRACTOR | 14,006,500.00 |
| 4f | MALES ARTISANS CONSTRUCTION | 24,421,748.77 |

**EVALUATION OF QUOTATIONS**

The Evaluation Team then proceeded to evaluate the quotations submitted by the contractors.

**LOT 1: CONSTRUCTION OF CHIMATIRO MATERNITY WING**

**1.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted quotation against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 4)* all the quotation from **Masuku Construction, Mathews Phiri Civil Engineering Contractors, Ettama Building and Civil Engineering and Great line Construction** were found to be **administratively compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 1 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Chimatiro Maternity Wing**

Table 4: preliminary evaluation sheet

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **BIDDER NO** | | | |
|  |  | **1a** | **2a** | **3a** | **4a** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **4** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **5** | **Adherence to Specified completion period** of 4 months | **Yes** | **yes** | **yes** | **yes** |
| **6** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **7** | Completeness of bids | yes | yes | **yes** | yes |
| 8 | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes | yes | yes |

**1.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from **Masuku Construction, Mathews Phiri Civil Engineering Contractors, Ettama Building and Civil Engineering and Great line Construction** against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, (Refer to Comparison Table 2) all the quotation were found to be **technically compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 1 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Chimatiro Martenity Wing**

Table 5: technical evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item no** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **BIDDER NO** | | | |
|  |  | **1a** | **2a** | **3a** | **4a** |
| **1** | Registration Certificate | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | NCIC certificate | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes | yes | yes |

**1.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made some corrections.

**1.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from all the bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below in descending order:

**Table 6: Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME OF BIDDER** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** | **REMARKS** |
| 2A | MATHEWS PHIRI CIVIL ENGINEERING CONTRACTOR | **47,735,722.35** | 1 | Corrected |
| 1A | MASIKU CONSTRUCTION | **62,488,628.70** | 2 | Corrected |
| 4A | GREATLINE CONSTRUCTION | **75,535,099.50** | 3 | Corrected |
| 3A | ETTAMA BUILDING AND CIVIL CONTRACTORS | **76,997,271.00** | 4 | Corrected |

**1.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of Chimatiro Maternity Wing be awarded to **Mathews Phiri Civil Engineering contractors** at contract amount of **MK47, 735,722.35** VAT inclusive.

**LOT 2: CONSTRUCTION OF LIVIRIVI EPA OFFICE BLOCK**

**2.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted bids against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 7*) three out of four quotations were found to be **administratively compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 2 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Livirivi EPA Office**

Table 7: preliminary evalution

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1b** | **2b** | **3b** | **4b** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | yes | yes | No |
| **4** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | yes | yes | No |
| **5** | Adherence to Specified completion period of 4 months | yes | No | yes | No |
| **6** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **7** | Completeness of bids | yes | yes | **yes** | yes |
| **8** | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | No | yes | No |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | No | yes | No |

**Note:**

*Bidder* ***2b*** *155 days as completion period instead 120 which 4 months, whereas bidder* ***4b*** *did not indicated anything on works commencement, bid validity as well as completion period of 4 months hence disqualified for further evaluation*

**2.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from **Mwaka Civil and Building Contractors** and **Males Artisan Construction** against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 8)* all the two quotations were found to be **technically compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 1 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Livirivi EPA office**

Table 8:Technical evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1b** | **3b** |
| **1** |  |  |  |
| **2** | Registration Certificate | **yes** | **yes** |
| **3** | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | **yes** | **yes** |
| **4** | NCIC certificate | **yes** | yes |
| 5 | **Responsive** | yes | yes |
| 6 | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes |

**2.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made some correction.

**2.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from the two bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below:

**Table 8.1: ranking**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** |
| 1B | Mwaka Civil and Building Contractors | **33,935,887.56** | 1 |
| 3B | Males Artisan Construction | **84,334,523.07** | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |

**2.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of Livirivi EPA office block be awarded to Mwaka Civil and Building Contractors at contract amount of **MK 33,935,887.56** VAT inclusive.

**LOT 3: CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL SHOPS IN BALAKA BUS DEPOT**

**3.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted bids against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 9)* three out of four quotations from **HECHI construction, Moprom construction, Aningo Civil and Building contractors and FT&L Civil Works** were found to be **administratively compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 3 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Commercial Shops in Bus Depot**

Table 9: preliminary evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1c** | **2c** | **3c** | **4c** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **4** | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **5** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | yes | yes |  |
| **6** | **Adherence to Specified completion period** of 4 months | **yes** | **yes** | **yes** | yes |
| **7** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **8** | Completeness of bids | yes | No | **yes** | yes |
| **9** | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | No | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | No | yes | yes |

Notes:

Bidder 2c had partial quote hence disqualified for further evaluation.

3.2 **TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from **Hech construction, Aningo Civil and Building Contractors and FT&L Genral Works** against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, *(Refer to Comparison Table 10)* all the three quotations were found to be **technically compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 3 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Commercial Shops in Bus Depot**

Table 10: Technical evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **BIDDER NO** | | |
|  |  | **1c** | **3c** | **4c** |
| **1** | Registration Certificate | yes | yes | Yes |
| **2** | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | yes | yes | Yes |
| **3** | NCIC certificate | yes | yes | Yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes | Yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes | Yes |

**3.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made no correction.

**3.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from all the bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below:

**Table 11: Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** | **REMARKS** |
| 1c | HECHI construction | **21,505,036.35** | 1 | corrected |
| 3c | Aningo Civil and Building Contractors | **36,807,285.00** | 2 | corrected |
| 4c | FT&L General Works | **38,613,106.50** | 3 | corrected |

**3.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of commercial shops in Balaka Bus Depot be awarded to bidder number 1c, **Hechi Construction** at contract amount of **MK 21,505,036.35**VAT inclusive.

**LOT 4: CONSTRUCTION OF MBERA RESOURCE CENTRE**

**4.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted bids against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 12)* all the four quotations From **Mande construction, Great line construction, Madziko construction and Patson construction** were found to be **administratively compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 4 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Mbera Resource Centre**

Table 12: preliminary Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1e** | **2e** | **3e** | **4e** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **4** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **5** | **Adherence to Specified completion period** of 4 months | **Yes** | yes | **yes** | **yes** |
| **6** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **7** | Completeness of bids | yes | yes | **yes** | yes |
| **8** | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes | yes | yes |

Notes

**4.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from **Patson construction, Madziko construction, Great line construction** and **Mande construction** against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, *(Refer to Comparison Table 13)* three out of four quotations were found to be **technically compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 4 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Mbera Resource Centre**

Table 13: Technical Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1e** | **2e** | **3e** | **4e** |
| **1** | Registration Certificate | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | NCIC certificate | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes | yes | yes |

**4.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made some corrections.

**4.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from all the bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below:

**Table 14: Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** |  |
| **4e** | PATSONS CONSTRUTION | **55,860,663.00** | 1 | Corrected |
| **2** | GREAT LINE CONSTRUCTION | **59,093,343.00** | 2 | corrected |
| **3e** | MAZIKO CONSTRUCTION | **75,451,616.25** | 3 | corrected |
| **1e** | MANDE CONSTRUCTION | 79,703,159.25 | 4 | corrected |

**4.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of Mbera Resource centre be awarded to **Patson Construction** at contract amount of **MK 55,860,663.00** VAT inclusive.

**LOT 5: CONSTRUCTION OF KACHENGA MARKET SHED**

**5.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted bids against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, *(Refer to Comparison Table 15)* all the four quotations from **Aningo civil and building contractors, Mobile building and civil contractors, Moprom Construction** and **HECHI construction** were found to be **administratively compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 5 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Kachenga Market Shed**

Table 15: Preliminary Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1d** | **2d** | **3d** | **4d** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **4** | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **5** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **6** | **Adherence to Specified completion period** of 4 months | yes | **yes** | yes | yes |
| **7** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **8** | Completeness of bids | No | yes | **no** | yes |
| **9** | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | No | yes | No | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | No | yes | No | yes |

Notes

1d and 3d had partial quote hence disqualified for further evaluation

**5.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from **Mobile Building Contractors & Civil Engineering** and **HECHI Construction** against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, (*Refer to Comparison Table 16*) all the two quotations from **Mobile Construction and Hechi Construction** were found to be **technically compliant** and were therefore considered for further evaluation

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 5 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Kachenga Market Shed**

Table 16: Technical Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **bidder** | |
|  |  | **2d** | **4d** |
| **1** | Registration Certificate | yes | yes |
| **2** | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | yes | yes |
| **3** | NCIC certificate | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes |

**5.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made no correction.

**5.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from all the bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below:

**Table 17: Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** | **REMARKS** |
| 4d | HECHI Cnstruction | 16,251,564.00 | 1 | corrected |
| 2d | Mobile Building Contractors & Civil Engineering | 19,372,498.50 | 2 | Not corrected |

**5.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of Kachenga Market Shed be awarded to **HECHI Construction** at contract amount of **MK16, 251,564.00** VAT inclusive.

**LOT 6: CONSTRUCTION OF CHIDZANJA MARKET SLOUGHTER HOUSE**

**6.1 ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team evaluated each of the submitted bids against the Standard Terms and Conditions of the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these terms.

Based on this assessment, *(Refer to Comparison Table 18)* one out of the four quotations from **Moprom Construction Mana Construction, AKunokusa Civil and Building Contractors and Males Artisan** was found to be **administratively compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **PRELIMINARY EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 6 Date: 28th October, 2021**

**Lot Name: construction of Chidzanja Market Slaughter House**

Table 18: Preliminary evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No,** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **1f** | **2f** | **3f** | **4f** |
| **1** | Verification | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **2** | Eligibility | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **3** | Availability of a well filled and signed submission sheet | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | Acceptance to **7** days works commencement period | yes | No | no | yes |
| **4** | Bid validity for **30** days | yes | No | no | yes |
|  | **Adherence to Specified completion period** of 4 months | **Yes** | **No** | No | yes |
| **5** | Availability of a well filled price schedule and signed | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| **6** | Completeness of bids | yes | yes | **yes** | yes |
| **7** | Currency of quotation in MK | yes | yes | yes | yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | No | No | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | No | No | yes |

**Notes**: *Bidders 1f had partial quote while 2f and 3f did not indicated the works commencement t and bid validity period hence disqualified for technical evaluation*

**6.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then evaluated the quotations from bidder 1f and 4f, **Moprom Construction** and **Males Artisan Construction** respectively against the Standard Technical requirements of the works as indicated in the RFQ to check for their compliance and ensure that there are no modifications or omissions to these requirements.

Based on this assessment, (Refer to Comparison Table 19) both quotations from **Moprom Construction** and **Artisan Construction** was found to be **technically compliant** and was therefore considered for further evaluation.

1. **DETAILED/TECHINICAL EVALUATION SHEET**

**Lot No: 6 Date: October 28, 2021**

**Lot Name: Construction of Chidzanja Market Slaughter House**

**Table 19: Technical evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **QUALIFICATION CRITERIA** | **BIDDER** | |
|  |  | 1f | 4f |
| 1 | Registration Certificate | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | Availability of Annual Tax Clearance certificate (MRA Cerificate) | Yes | Yes |
| 3 | NCIC certificate | Yes | Yes |
|  | **Responsive** | yes | yes |
|  | **Accepted for detailed evaluation?** | yes | yes |

**6.3 FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

The Evaluation Team then checked all bidders’ quotations for arithmetical errors and made minor corrections.

**6.4 FINAL RANKING**

The Evaluation Committee then ranked the quotation from all the bidders based on the final bid prices as indicated below:

**Table 20: Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BID No** | **NAME** | **BID PRICE** | **RANKING** | **REMARKS** |
| 1f | Moprom Construction | 15,826,942.95 | 1 | corrected |
| 4f | Males Artisan Construction | 24,448,215.09 | 2 | Corrected |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**6.5 RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the final ranking table above, the Evaluation team therefore recommends that contract for the construction of **Chidzanja Market Slaughter House** be awarded to **Moprom Construction** at contract amount of **MK 15,826,942.95** VAT inclusive.
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