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**1.0 Introduction**

The Bid Evaluation Report contains the findings of bids submitted in relation to Construction of Chinkhwiri Police Unit (Administration Block) – T.A. Chakhaza. Under GESD.

**Table 1 Project Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project identification** | | |
| Name of project | Construction of Chinkhwiri Police Unit (Administration Block) – T.A. Chakhaza. | |
| Purchaser (or Employer)  (a) name  (b) address | Dowa District Council  Private Bag 2, Dowa, Malawi. | |
| Contract number (identification) | **MW-DDC-316277-CW-RFB** | |
| Contract description | Construction of Chinkhwiri Police Unit (Administration Block) – T.A. Chakhaza. | |
| Method of procurement | National Competitive Bidding | |
| Fixed price contract | Yes ***√*** No | |
| **Bidding process** | | |
| Specific Procurement Notice  (a) name of national newspaper  (b) issue date | The Nation News Paper  **24th October,2022** | |
| Standard Bidding Document  (a) title, publication date  (b) date of issue to bidders | Construction of Chinkhwiri Police Unit (Administration Block) – T.A. Chakhaza.  **24th October,2022** | |
| Number of firms issued documents |  | |
| Amendments to documents | No. | |
| **Bid submission and opening** | | |
| Bid submission deadline  (a) original date, time  (b) extensions, if any | | 23rd November 2022 14:00Hours local time  Yes |
| Bid opening date, time | |  |
| Number of bids submitted | |  |
| Bid validity period (days or weeks)  (a) originally specified  (b) extensions, if any | |  |

1. **Collection of bid documents**

Tender documents were collected from Dowa District Council upon payment of a non-refundable fee of MWK20, 000.00 for each document.

1. **Tender submission**

The Deadline for submission of bids was on 23rd November, 2022 at 14:00 Hours local time. Tenders were submitted at Dowa District Council before close of submission time. Late tenders were rejected. Thereafter the bids were opened in the presence of bidders that attended the opening ceremony. Refer to tender opening results in Table 2 below:

**Table 2 Bid prices (as read out)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **COMPANY NAME** | **READ OUT AMOUNT** |
| **1** | Pilirani Civil Engineering & Building contractors | 67,950,201.75 |
| 2 | Malima construction | 105,694,160.17 |
| 3 | Chakhuwala Building contractors | 144,503,067.37 |
| 4 | Taf Civil and Building Contractors | 74,833,745.33 |
| 5 | Prichala Contractor | 102,062,224.00 |
| 6 | Rhema B/contractors | 70,387,617.74 |
| 7 | Interpave 2010 | 94,924,935.88 |
| 8 | F&R civil engineering | 57,129,966.57 |
|  | Vision Building contractors | 101,977,715.33 |
| 10 | Manjawila contractor | 80,666,769.00 |
| 11 | Apule construction | 80,041,230.50 |
| 12 | Bethel Investment | 106,978,520.00 |
| 13 | Stande BC Construction | 92,461,601.33 |
| 14 | Cleth Construction | 81,307,242.50 |
| 15 | Chariton Construction | 105,103,103.03 |
| 16 | Eunick Contractor | 88,136,215.86 |
| 17 | Jags | 113,933,078.88 |
| 18 | Cheyeka Bc | 113,388,160.56 |
| 19 | Legancy Property Developers | 85,130,189.38 |
| 20 | Awonenj | 62,351,470.50 |
| 21 | Losiwa | 67,738,599.50 |
| 22 | Urban and rural | 113,383,961.96 |

1. **Preliminary Examination**
   1. **Tender responsiveness**

Tenders were examined on whether or not the criteria indicated in the instruction to bidders have been satisfied. As indicated in ITB the relevant provisions regarding administrative and technical responsiveness are shown in Table below

Firms, that were not administratively responsive, were disqualified and were not considered for technical evaluation. An administratively responsive tender is one which conforms to all requirements in the ITB.

|  | **Responsiveness Examination** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Bidder** | | **1.1**  **Verification** | | | | | | **1.3**  **Bid Security** | **1.4**  **Completeness of Bid** | | | |  | **Overall Decision (A/R)** |
| Bid validity period 120 | Signed bidding form | Priced bill of quantity | Buildings NCIC certificate of 100m | Business registration | MRA Tax clearance certificate | Bid securing declaration form | Sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment performance declaration | Letter of acceptance of the world bank anti-corruption guidelines and sancton | Code of conduct for contract personnel | Letter of credit from the bank | Management strategies and implementation plans |  |
| Pilirani Civil Engineering & Building contractors | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Malima construction | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Chakhuwala Building contractors | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Taf Civil and Building Contractors | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Prichala Contractor | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Rhema B/contractors | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Interpave 2010 | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| F&R civil engineering | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[1]](#footnote-1) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Vision Building contractors | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Manjawila contractor | | Y | Y | Y | N[[2]](#footnote-2) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Apule construction | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Bethel Investment | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Stande BC Construction | | Y | Y | N[[3]](#footnote-3) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Cleth Construction | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[4]](#footnote-4) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Chariton Construction | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Eunick Contractor | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Jags | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Cheyeka Bc | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Legancy Property Developers | | Y | Y | N[[5]](#footnote-5) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Awonenji | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[6]](#footnote-6) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Losiwa | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[7]](#footnote-7) | Y | Y | **R** |
| Urban and rural | | Y | Y | N[[8]](#footnote-8) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Y stands for Yes N stands for no R stand for Rejected A for Accepted | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |

1. **Detailed Examination**

The detailed examination of substantially responsive bids was done as follows:

| **Evaluation and Qualification Criteria** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of bidder** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** |  | **A/R** |
| Average annual turn-over for the last 3 years(20 million kwacha for each lot) | Experience as a prime contractor in the construction (at least three jobs of similar in nature and complexity for all lots) | Essential equipment: Lorry (5- 10-ton) Porker and concrete vibrator; Concrete Mixer Pick up (1 ton) Plate Compactor | Site Agent- BSc in Civil Engineering with a minimum of 3years of experience or Diploma in Civil | Foreman- Grade 1 Trade Test Certificate in bricklaying or its equivalent from reputable institution and with at least 3 years’. | **Environmental and Social Safeguards Officer-**Minimum Bachelor of Science in Environmental Sciences or Natural Resources. | Health and Safety Specialist- Diploma in Public Health or Environmental Health or its equivalent from |
| Pilirani Civil Engineering & Building contractors | Y | N[[9]](#footnote-9) | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **R** |
| Malima construction | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Chakhuwala Building contractors | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Taf Civil and Building Contractors | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Prichala Contractor | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Rhema B/contractors | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Interpave 2010 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Vision Building contractors | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Apule construction | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Bethel Investment | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[10]](#footnote-10) | Y | **R** |
| Chariton Construction | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Eunick Contractor | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Jags | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | **A** |
| Cheyeka Bc | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N[[11]](#footnote-11) | Y | **R** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. **Correction of Arithmetical Errors**

The corrected bid prices are shown in Table 5:

Annex 1, contains a detailed financial evaluation of the bids.

**Table 5 Correction of arithmetic errors**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Bidder** | **Read-out Bid Price(s)** | | **Corrections** | **Corrected Bid Price(s)** |
|  | **Currency**  **(ies)** | **Amount(s)** | **Computational Errors** |  |
| ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e) = (c)± (d)*** |
| TAF | MK | 77,878,124.00 | *3,217,783.44* | 81,095,907.44 |
| Apule | MK | 80,041,230.00 | 1,740,027.25 | 81,781,257.25 |
| Eunick | MK | 88,136,215.86 | *1,591,383.88* | 89,727,599.74 |
| Stande | MK | 92,461,601.38 | 1,251,472.62 | 93,713,074.00 |
| Interpave | MK | 94,924,935.88 | 825,434.22 | 95,750,370.10 |
| Malima | MK | 105,694,160.65 | *0* | 105,694,160.65 |
| Prichala | MK | 102,062,224.00 | *0* | 102,062,224.00 |
| Chariton | MK | 103,103,103.03 | 6,296,960.00 | 109,400,063.03 |
| JAGS | MK | 113,933,078.88 | 990,722.42 | 114,923,801.30 |
| Chakhuwala | MK | 144,503,067.37 | *0* | 144,503,067.37 |
| Rhema B contractor | MK | 70,387,617.74 | *0* | 70,387,617.74 |

* 1. **Ranking of Bids**

After Arithmetic corrections, bids were ranked according to the contract sums from the lowest to the highest. Table 6 gives the substantially responsive bidders ranked from lowest to highest.

**Table 6 Ranking of Bids**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rank** | **Name of Contractor** | **Amount**  **MWK** |
| 1 | Rhema B Contractor | 70,387,617.74 |
| 2 | TAF | 81,095,907.44 |
| 3 | Apule | 81,781,257.25 |
| 4 | Eunick | 89,727,599.74 |
| 5 | Stande | 93,713,074.00 |
| 6 | Interpave | 95,750,370.10 |
| 7 | Malima | 101,551,737.93 |
| 8 | Prichala | 102,375,415.00 |
| 9 | Chariton | 109,400,063.03 |
| 10 | JAGS | 114,923,801.30 |
| 11 | Chakhuwala | 144,503,067.37 |

1. **Recommendations for award**

From the Financial examination above, **Bidder No. 1. Rhema B Contraactor** is the lowest evaluated bidder. But since in the bidding document it was indicated different personally per Lot Rhema B Contractor has the same personally from lot 1 of Dzoole Police Unit. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee recommends the contract to be awarded to the second lowest evaluated bidder **Taf Construction** at the contract sum of **MWK 81,095,907.44 which** includes 1% NCIC and 16.5% VAT.

1. **Confirmation of Bid Evaluation Report**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **No** | 1. **Name** | 1. **Designation** | 1. **Signature** |
| 1. 1 |  |  |  |
| 1. 2 |  |  |  |
| 1. 3 |  |  |  |
| 1. 4 |  |  |  |
| 1. 5 |  |  |  |

1. Bid declaration form altered [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. NCIC certificate is for civil not building [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Omitted item 9.1B in BoQ [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Altered bid security declaration [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Omitted item in ESHS [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Bid declaration form altered (24months) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. code of conduct not signed [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. not priced EHSH [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. did not have the recommended past experience [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. No qualifications for environmental Officer [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Did not have Health and safety specialist personnel [↑](#footnote-ref-11)