

#### 7-Minyahil Tefera GC

- Letter of Bid not fulfilled with necessary information and became blank and no response to the requirements for instant Performance security ES and Potential Adjudicator, which contradict as per ITB 15.1 and ITB 49.1 respectively.

#### 8- Cosmos Engineering & Commerce PLC

- Letter of Bid not fulfilled with necessary information and became blank and no response to the requirements for instant Performance security ES
- Letter of Bid #7 (performance security for Environmental and Social Security not fulfilled correctly with necessary information).
- The Letter of Bid was missing key information, including the proposed Adjudicator, as required under as per ITB BDS 49.1.

**NB:** The aforementioned **seven(7)** bidders were deemed non-responsive and excluded from the technical evaluation phase due to material deficiencies, unauthorized alterations of the bid template, omission of critical documents, and failure to comply with eligibility, legal and ES requirements as stipulated in the bidding documents.

The following **ten (10) bidders** found to have met all preliminary requirements and therefore advanced to the Technical Evaluation stage:

1. Gashaw Benti WWC & BC
2. Barkot Construction GC & WWC-1 GC & WWC-1
3. Nehmiya Engineering PLC
4. Wada Engineering
5. Zemenay Gashiye GC
6. Pavilion GC & WWC
7. Equatorial Construction PLC
8. Tadase Benti WWC JV with DAD Construction & Trading
9. Yishak Abebe GC

These firms further evaluated based on the Qualification and Evaluation Criteria outlined under Section III of the Bidding Document, focusing on experience, personnel, equipment, and methodology among others.



### 3.4. Remarks on Technical Evaluation

Following successful completion of the preliminary evaluation, bidders who met the basic eligibility and administrative requirements advanced to the technical evaluation stage. This stage carried out in accordance with the criteria outlined in Section III: Evaluation and Qualification Requirements of the Bidding Document. The purpose of the technical evaluation is to assess the bidders' qualifications, personnel, experience, and proposed methodology to determine their capacity to execute the works effectively and in compliance with the required standards.

Upon review, **seven (7) bidders** wound to be non-responsive at the technical stage due to major shortcomings in experience documentation, staffing, compliance with project-specific planning, and failure to adhere to key environmental and social safeguards. Below is a detailed justification for each:

#### 1. Gashaw Benti WWC & BC

- **Professional Licensing:** The Social Specialist and Site Organizer lacked valid professional licenses. Additionally, the agreements between these experts and the company were neither signed nor time-bound, undermining the credibility of personnel commitment.
- **CV Authorization:** CVs for all key experts, including the Project Manager, were neither signed by the experts themselves nor endorsed by the company's authorized representative, violating bid form requirements.
- **Qualification Mismatch:** The Environmental, Climate, and Safeguard Specialist's academic background and professional credentials did not align with the required qualifications outlined in the bid document.
- **Code of Conduct:** The submitted Code of Conduct failed to include provisions on the prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and Gender-Based Violence (GBV), which are essential under the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF).
- **Work Planning:** The bidder did not submit the Material, Human Resource, Equipment, and Cash Flow Master Schedule via the required project management software, nor was a resource allocation sheet included.

#### 2. Zemenay Gashaye GC

- **Invalid Financial Audit:** The private auditor's trade license was issued in 2023 (2016 EC), making the audit results for the period 2020–2024 legally invalid and unacceptable.
- **Turnover Requirement:** The average annual construction turnover, as stated in a confirmation letter from the Tax Office, failed to meet the minimum threshold required by the bidding document.





- **Master Schedules Missing:** No submission of Material, Equipment, Human Resource, or Cash Flow schedules through the designated project software; resource allocation sheet also missing.
- **Code of Conduct:** The Code of Conduct was not prepared under the bidder's official name, but rather under another company's name—raising concerns of authenticity.
- **Professional Licensing:** The Social Specialist and Site Organizer were not licensed professionals.
- **CV Format Non-Compliance:** CVs were not completed using the designated bidding forms and lacked necessary authorization by the company's representative.

### 3. Pavilion GC & WWC

- **Unacceptable Audit Report:** The audit report was conducted by a private auditor whose license had not been renewed, rendering the report invalid for evaluation purposes.
- **Missing ESHS Code of Conduct:** The bidder did not submit a Code of Conduct addressing Environmental, Social, Health, and Safety (ESHS) standards.
- **Incomplete Work Planning:** Required master schedules for resources were not prepared or submitted through the specified project software.
- **Unqualified Personnel:** Neither the Environmental and Social Specialist nor the Social Specialist and Site Organizer held the necessary professional licenses.

### 4. Wada Engineering PLC

- **Work Planning Deficiency:** Material, Equipment, Cash Flow, and Human Resource schedules were not submitted through the designated project software.
- **Personnel Qualifications:** The Social Specialist and Site Organizer lacked the required academic and professional credentials.
- **Incomplete Personnel Agreement:** The required Code of Conduct agreements between the bidder and all key experts were missing; only the Environmental and Social Specialist was covered.

### 5. Tadase Benti WWC JV with DAD Construction & Trading

- **Master Schedules Not Submitted:** Material, Equipment, and Human Resource schedules were not prepared in project software format and were entirely missing.
- **Missing Code of Conduct Agreements:** No evidence of executed agreements between the bidder and the proposed experts using the official bidding forms.
- **Unqualified Experts:** The Environmental and Social Specialist, as well as the Social Specialist and Site Organizer, lacked the necessary academic qualifications and valid licenses to fulfill their roles.



#### 6. Yishak Abebe GC

- **Financial Ineligibility:** Both the average annual construction turnover and the overall annual turnover were below the minimum thresholds required.
- **Work Planning Deficiency:** No master schedules were prepared or submitted through project software.
- **Unqualified Personnel:** The Environmental and Social Specialist's qualifications did not align with the required standards; additionally, the Social Specialist and Site Organizer lacked professional licenses.

#### 7. Nehmiya Engineering PLC

- **Lack of Experience:** The bidder submitted both general and specific construction experiences dated before the company's establishment, thereby not fulfilling the requirement.
- **Unsubstantiated Financial Turnover:** The turnover evidence provided by the bidder's supporting letter based on non-existent experience, lacking credibility.
- **Invalid Audit Report:** The audit report referenced the years 2012–2013 EC, which predated the formation of the company, making it invalid.

After comprehensive review, the evaluation team concluded that **only three (3) bidders** fully satisfied the technical evaluation requirements and considered responsive for progression to the financial evaluation stage.

These bidders are:

1. Barkot Construction GC & WWC-1
2. Equatorial Construction PLC

These firms demonstrated acceptable financial soundness, qualified personnel, valid licensing, and comprehensive project planning in accordance with the bidding document requirements.





### 3.5. Financial Evaluation

**Table 4: Lot-1(Oda Muda) Financial evaluation results**

Following the completion of the financial evaluation in accordance with the World Bank procurement guidelines and the PACT project's procurement procedures, the recommended least evaluated bidder is identified as follows:

No	Name of the Contractors	Read out price				Price adjusted after arithmetic check		Rank
		With Out VAT	After Rabbet (%)	With VAT (15%)	With Out VAT	After Rabbet (%)	With VAT (15%)	
1	Barkot Construction	221,058,912.92		254,257,795.86	220,863,881.44		253,993,463.66	1 <sup>st</sup>
2	Equatorial Construction PLC	222,826,407	3%	248,562,857.23	234,277,441.27	3%	261,336,485.74	2 <sup>nd</sup>

The recommended bidder submitted a substantially responsive bid in the technical evaluation and passed all qualification requirements.

The evaluated bid price is determined after applying all necessary adjustments in accordance with the bidding documents.



#### 4.2. Remark on Preliminary evaluation

The preliminary evaluation carried out to assess the administrative compliance and responsiveness of bids based on the requirements stated in the Instructions to Bidders (ITB) and Section IV: Bidding Forms of the IFAD procurement document. Bids that failed to comply with these essential submission requirements considered non-responsive and disqualified from proceeding to the technical evaluation stage.

##### 1-Sofaniyas Getu Abebe WWGC-3

- No Letter of Bid submitted according to IFAD tender document Section IV Bidding form and it altered, substituted and fulfilled with unnecessary information.
- Not Submitted on Letter of Bid Bank's SEA and/or SH disqualification.

##### 2-Walif Construction Share Company GC-3

- Letter of Bid altered, substituted and modified which contradict as per ITB 15.1 and 49.1.
- Specifically the Letter of Bid #12, which addresses the disclosure of commissions, gratuities, or fees, completed with inappropriate or unnecessary information. The section intended to be marked "None" unless such payments actually made. Including irrelevant details not only violates the intended purpose of the clause but may also raise concerns of transparency and ethical compliance. Due to these inconsistencies and breaches of the bidding document provisions, the bid declared non-responsive and excluded from further evaluation.

The following **five (5) bidders** found to have met all preliminary requirements and therefore advanced to the Technical Evaluation stage:





#### 4.4. Remarks on Technical evaluation

Following the preliminary assessment, technically compliant bids reviewed against the criteria outlined in Section III: Evaluation and Qualification Requirements of the Bidding Document. The objective of this phase is to determine whether bidders possess the technical, **work methods**, financial, and human resource capacity to successfully execute the proposed works.

After a detailed assessment, the following three (3) bidders were determined to be non-responsive at the technical evaluation stage due to significant deficiencies in documentation, qualifications, and non-compliance with submission formats. Detailed justifications provided below:

##### 1) Shodeb Engineering GWWC-1 JV with Dedefo Tenesho WWC-1

- Financial Documentation Non-compliance: The required evidence of access to cash flow submitted only by one partner in the joint venture, rather than as a consolidated financial representation of all JV members, as stipulated in the bidding requirements. This undermines the financial assessment of the joint entity.
- Audit Reports: The audit reports for the years 2020–2024 GC were provided only by one JV member. However, under joint venture arrangements, financial statements must reflect the combined capacity of all partners. This partial submission renders the documents inadmissible.
- Experience Records: Similarly, the specific construction experience and contract management records submitted only for a single partner, not collectively for the JV. As per evaluation requirements, such experience must represent the combined capacity of all JV members. This oversight indicates non-compliance with core qualification criteria.
- Work Planning Deficiency: The Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule was not prepared or submitted using the prescribed project software, nor were the required planning and resource allocation tools included. This omission compromises the ability to evaluate the bidder's project readiness and resource planning.

Due to the absence of combined JV submissions for key financial and technical criteria, as well as missing work planning documentation, this bid deemed non-responsive at the technical stage.

##### 2) Adugna Ijigu Hordofa GC-3

- Lack of Experience: The bidder failed to provide any valid evidence of general construction or specific project experience, which are essential prerequisites for demonstrating technical capacity.
- Fraudulent Financial Documentation: The audit reports, average annual turnover, and construction turnover submissions were determined to be non-existent and fabricated. These falsified records represent a serious violation of bidding ethics and procurement integrity.

