

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF BID EVALUATION REPORT

(In terms of Section 55 (4)(b) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015) as amended)

SUPPLY OF 120 HP LAPTOP COMPUTERS AND 415 HP DESKTOP COMPUTERS

PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO: G/ONB/UNAM-02/2025

1. Scope of Contract

The Directorate of Information Communication Technology Services (DICTS) is procuring 120 laptops to replace obsolete hardware and equip new staff. This initiative ensures all personnel have the necessary tools for effective performance, maintaining organizational productivity and operational continuity.

Key highlights of this procurement include:

- Infrastructure Refresh: Replacing aging devices that no longer meet current security or performance standards.
- Workforce Enablement: Providing essential computing resources for newly appointed members of the workforce.
- Strategic Alignment: Fulfilling the Directorate's mandate to maintain a robust and efficient technological environment

2. Procurement method used

Open Advertised Bidding in the form of Open National Bidding, in terms of section 27 (1)(i) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015) as amended.

3. Date of Invitation of Bids

17 November 2025

4. Closing date for submission of bids

30 January 2026 at 15h00.

5. Date and place of opening of bids

30 January 2026 at 15h00.

University of Namibia (UNAM) Main Campus, Administration Building, Ground Floor, 340 Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue, Pioneers Park, Windhoek

6. Number of bids received by closing date

35

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	ULTIMATE INVESTMENT CC	9,547,489.90	No	- The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document.
2	PRIME INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	11,016,555.00	No	- The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
3	ILAND INVESTMENTS CC	7,355,250.00	No	- The bidder submitted a false manufacturer authorization letter.
4	TMU SUPPLY AND DELIVERY SERVICES (PTY) LTD	9,809,190.00	Yes	- Not the lowest responsive bidder
5	VIRTUA TECHNOLOGIES (PTY) LTD	9,306,774.35	Yes	-
6	ETA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & TRADING CC	15,620,186.70	No	- The bidder provided a performance guarantee letter instead of a bank overdraft letter, a bank statement or a bank letter as was required. - The bidder did not provide the manufacturer authorization letter of their supplier as requested in the bidding document
7	LENI-IN INVESTMENT CC	8,507,750.00	No	- The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
8	PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT CENTRE	10,123,601.00	Yes	- Not the lowest responsive bidder
9	SHINE TECHNOLOGIES SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD	9,201,850.60	Yes	- Not the lowest responsive bidder
10	SIRKA INVESTMENT CC	10,341,222.19	No	- The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
11	OTTER INVESTMENTS CC	13,700,088.00	No	- The bidder did not provide their supplier's authorization letter. - The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - Although the company is owned by one person, the said owner is not the one who signed and completed the bidding document and there is no Power of Attorney authorizing the signatory to represent the bidder in the completion and signing of the bid.
12	BUSINESS CONNEXION NAMIBIA	10,117,342.23	Yes	- Not the lowest responsive bidder
13	ACUNAM INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (PTY) LTD	8,863,051.40	No	- The bidder provided a performance guarantee letter instead of a bank overdraft letter, a bank statement or a bank letter as was required.
14	BLUESKY TECHNOLOGIES (PTY) LTD	9,817,620.00	No	- The bidder submitted an expired manufacturer authorization. Moreover, the bidder did not provide a manufacturer authorization for their supplier.

				- The bidder's liquid assets do not amount to 70% of their bid price as required in the bidding document.
15	DATAKOM TECHNOLOGIES CC	9,767,845.00	No	- The bidder did not provide the proof of liquid assets required in the bidding document, instead a bank confirmation and bank rating letter was submitted with the bid.
16	BPI INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES	16,610,196.61	No	- The bidder did not provide their supplier's authorization letter. - NAMRA good standing certificate was issued 29/09/2025, valid until 27/01/2026. Therefore as 30/01/2026 (deadline for submission of bids) the bidders good standing tax certificate is invalid.
17	EMA MARQUEZ TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES CC	13,297,500.00	No	- The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document.
18	GREEN ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD	10,407,359.45	No	- The bidder has not attached a letter of warranty or the provision of aftersales services on their company letter head as required in the bid document
19	KRETVUVA INVESTMENTS CC	11,871,158.00	No	- The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
20	EKONDJITHO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES CC	11,744,685.45	No	- The bidder provided a performance guarantee letter instead of a bank overdraft letter, a bank statement or a bank letter as was required.
21	ALTUS INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY CC	10,474,344.35	No	- The bidder did not provide the proof of liquid assets required in the bidding document, instead a bank confirmation and bank rating letter was submitted with the bid. Moreover, the letter only indicated that the bank would consider assisting them with financing assistance with not a pre-qualified amount.
22	SCHOEMANS TECHNOLOGIES	9,233,996.25	No	- The bidder did not provide the proof of liquid assets required in the bidding document, instead a bank confirmation and bank rating together with a performances guarantee letter was submitted with the bid.
23	ESSENTIAL INVESTMENTS CC	11,077,328.45	No	- The bidder did not provide the power of attorney, even though the company is owned by more than one person.
24	DU LOGISTICS TRADING ENTERPRISES CC	9,906,107.00	No	- The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide any manufacturer authorization letter.
25	GEE AND SONS TRADING CC	14,846,625.00	No	- The bidder's liquid assets (bank statement) do not amount to 70% of the bid price as required in the bidding document. - The bidder also only provided a bank confirmation and bank rating letter.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
26	DEE MAT INVESTMENT GROUP NAMIBIA	12,863,011.95	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter
27	KODI INVESTMENT CC	14,431,680.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder did not provide any manufacturer authorization letter. - The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document.
28	COMPLETE ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS NAMIBIA (PTY) LTD	10,240,635.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder did not provide their supplier's authorization letter. - The bidder has not provided the proof of liquid assets as required in the bidding document.
29	TWINRAIN TECHNOLOGIES SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD	10,077,900.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided a performance guarantee letter instead of a bank overdraft letter, a bank statement or a bank letter as was required.
30	SCHLIP VISION TRADING CC	11,381,685.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder did not provide their supplier's authorization letter. - The bidder has not provided the proof of liquid assets as required in the bidding document.
31	ENTHUSIAST TECHNOLOGY CC	12,402,380.75	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided a bank rating letter in which a tender is mentioned, however the letter contains no information of any tender, just the name of the University with no date. - The bidder also provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide their supplier's manufacturer authorization letter.
32	EXPLORE AFRICA INVESTMENT (PTY) LTD	11,139,507.50	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder provided a letter from DBN stating that their application for funds will be considered and not that the bank has preapproved them for a certain amount as required in the bidding document. - The bidder did not provide any manufacturer authorization letter.
33	FOURTH POST TECHNOLOGIES CC	11,186,925.83	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder did not provide an HP manufacturer authorization letter. - The bidder has not provided the proof of liquid assets as required in the bidding document.
34	DOWA INVESTMENTS CC	12,904,690.00	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bidder did not provide their supplier's authorization letter.

				- The bidder only provided a letter for performance guarantee and bank rating.
35	NAMIBIA OFFICE EQUIPMENT CO (PTY) LTD T/A NASHUA NAMIBIA	9,495,694.25	No	- The bidder's reference letters are for the supply of printers which is not relevant/related to this procurement. Moreover, the bidder has not attached a letter of warranty or the provision of after-sales services on their company letter head as required in the bid document.

8. Financial evaluation of responsive bid:

RANK	BIDDER	PRICE EXCLUSIVE OF VAT PRICE (N\$)	VAT PRICE (N\$)	TOTAL COST PRICE (N\$)
1	VIRTUA TECHNOLOGIES (PTY) LTD	8,351,535.65	1,252,730.35	9,604,266.00
2	TMU SUPPLY & DELIVERY PTY (LTD)	8,572,490.00	1,285,873.50	9,858,363.50
3	SHINE TECHNOLOGIES SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD	8,875,029.80	1,331,254.4	10,206,284.27
4	BUSINESS CONNEXION	8,899,122.18	1,334,868.33	10,233,990.51
5	PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT CENTRE	9,044,601.00	1,356,690.15	10,401,291.15

9. Best Evaluated Bids:

NAME OF BIDDER	AWARD AMOUNT (N\$)
VIRTUA TECHNOLOGIES (PTY) LTD	9,604,266.00