



**MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIES, MINES AND ENERGY
PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT UNIT (PMU)**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT
[Issued in terms of section 7(1)(i) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015]**

PROJECT TITLE: Hiring/ leasing of Seven (7) New Multi-Function Network Printers for a period of 36 months.

REFERENCE NUMBER OF PROCUREMENT: NCS/ONB/15-01/25/26

Scope of Contract: Hiring/ leasing of Seven (7) New Multi-Function Network Printers for a period of 36 months.

Procurement Method Used: Open National Bidding

Date of Bids Invitation: 26 August 2025

Closing Date of Bids Submission: 26 September 2025

Number of Bids Received by Closing Date: Eighteen (18)

Responsiveness of Bids: Eighteen (18)

Summary of Bidder's Responsiveness

| No. of Bidder's Offer | Complete Name and Address of the Seat of the Bidder | RESPONSIVE/ NON-RESPONSIVE | Explanation for Disqualified Bidder |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1. | G-Tech Office Equipment | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 2. | Touchup Investments cc | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) No Dealership/ Manufacturing authorization attached, only attached a reseller letter (refer to page 32, no.9) |
| 3. | Partition Technologies cc | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Dealership/ Manufacturing authorization attached, only attached a reseller letter (refer to page 32, no.9) |
| 4. | Performance Development Centre (PDC) | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 5. | KG Trading Enterprises | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. Only have for N\$ 800,000.00 (refer to page 32, no.12) No CVs of the technical team is attached. (refer to page 32, no.16) |
| 6. | Amana Technology | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No technical capabilities evidence as required (refer to page 32, no.16) Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 7. | EMA Technology | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inhouse employee did not attach the CV with evidence to show technical capabilities. (refer to page 33, no.16) |
| 8. | Minolco (Pty)Ltd | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) No Dealership/ Manufacturing authorization attached, only attached a reseller letter (refer to page 32, no.9) |
| 9. | Enthusiast Technology | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 10. | ConoCopy (Pty) Ltd | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report. (refer to page 32, no.14) • No Dealership/ Manufacturing authorization attached, only attached a reseller letter (refer to page 32, no.9) |
| 11. | Emweno Group Investment | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference letters attached do not meet the requirements (refer to page 32, no.13) • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 12. | Bluesky Technologies | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 13. | Green Enterprise Solutions | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 14. | Tomkapo Investments cc | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) • No Dealership/ Manufacturing authorization attached, only attached a reseller letter. (refer to page 32, no.9) • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 15. | Essential Investment cc | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder only submitted a credit rating instead of the required credit facility of N\$ 1,500,000.00. (refer to page 32, no.12) • Bidder did not submit social security statement of employee's report (refer to page 32, no.14) |
| 16. | Hash Procurement | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No datasheet was provided to specify the printer's specifications; therefore, no comparison could be made. |
| 17. | NASHUA | NON-RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bidder listed multiple printer models without clearly identifying the specific model proposed for supply. As a result, the committee could not perform a proper technical compliance assessment against the specification. • The printer models referenced in the submission do not meet the mandatory technical requirements. In particular, the declared |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | warm-up times exceed the specified maximum requirement of approximately 18 seconds or less, which is a compulsory performance criterion. |
| 18. | Ekwathela Trading | RESPONSIVE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A |

Price Comparison for Responsive Bids:

| Company Name | Bid Amount (N\$) VAT Incl |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ekwathela Trading | N\$ 856,493.00 |

Best Evaluated Bid:

The bid evaluation committee, in terms of section 52 (13) read in conjunction with section 52 (9) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act 15 of 2015), After the examination and evaluation of the bids for BID No. **NCS/ONB/15-01/25/26**, the bid submitted by **Ekwathela Trading cc** was identified as offering the best economic advantage. It is therefore recommended that the contract be awarded to **Ekwathela Trading cc** as the most responsive and evaluated bidder, for a total amount of **N\$856,493.00 (Eight Hundred and Fifty-Six Thousand, Four Hundred and Ninety-Three Namibian Dollars Only)**.