

- Missing Work Plans: The bidder did not submit the Material, Human Resource, Equipment, Cash Flow Master Schedule, or a valid Construction Methodology using the required project software tools. The complete absence of these fundamental planning documents made it impossible to assess the bidder's practical execution strategy.
- Given the lack of verifiable experience, submission of forged financial documents, and failure to submit essential work plans, this bid classified as non-responsive and rejected at the technical evaluation stage.

### 3) Yabcon Construction & Engineering WWC-1

- Missing Code of Conduct: The bidder did not submit the Code of Conduct for Contractor Personnel, which is required to be prepared using the official bidding form and must include signed agreements between the bidder and all proposed key experts. This document is critical for ensuring contractor compliance with Environmental, Social, Health, and Safety (ESHS) standards, including commitments to prevent Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and Gender-Based Violence (GBV).
- Personnel Licensing: The Social Specialist and Site Organizer proposed in the bid lacked valid professional licenses, thereby failing to meet the minimum qualification requirements for these positions.
- Incomplete Work Schedules: The bidder did not prepare or submit the Material and Equipment Master Schedules using the designated project software. These schedules are vital to evaluate the bidder's resource planning, mobilization timeline, and project execution framework.
- Due to missing compliance documentation, unlicensed key personnel, and failure to provide required project schedules, the bidder found to be non-responsive in the technical evaluation stage.

The above-listed bidders failed to meet one or more essential technical evaluation criteria. Their submissions either lacked required documentation, included unverifiable or fraudulent information, or were incomplete in terms of personnel, planning, or compliance standards. As a result, these bids rejected from further consideration in accordance with the rules and criteria established in the Bidding Documents



#### 4.5. 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 identified as follows:

**Table 7: Financial evaluation results of Rorisa SSIP**

No	Name of the Contractors	Read out price				Price adjusted after arithmetic check				Ranks
		With VAT	Out	After Rabbet (%)	With VAT (15%)	With VAT	Out	After Rabbet (%)	With VAT (15%)	
1	Oda Construction PLC GC-5 JV with Bonny Degebass GWWC-3	50,080,580.98			57,592,668.12	58,080,613.59			66,792,705.63	1 <sup>st</sup>
2	Tinsa'e Ashok Kumar WWGC-1	67,128,917.30			77,198,254.90	62,762,642.21			72,182,788.55	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.





## 5.2. Remark on the Preliminary Evaluation

In accordance with the procedures outlined in the Instructions to Bidders (ITB) and Section IV of the IFAD Bidding Document, a comprehensive preliminary evaluation was conducted to assess the administrative compliance, completeness, and eligibility of submitted bids. Bidders who failed to meet the minimum requirements or deviated from critical submission standards were considered non-responsive and were not advanced to the technical evaluation stage.

The evaluation results determined that seven (7) bidders did not meet the requirements. Below is a detailed justification for the disqualification of each:

### 1. Kanenus WWC PLC

- **The Letter of Bid** was incomplete and improperly filled, with the following specific issues: Serial No. 6: The Bid Validity Period was not correctly stated in accordance with ITB Clause 21.1. Serial No. 7: The Performance Security (including Environmental and Social requirements) was altered and not correctly fulfilled, violating ITB Clause 47.1. Serial No. 19: The section designating the Adjudicator was not properly completed, contradicting ITB Clause 49.1.
- **Additionally**, the bidder failed to submit *key eligibility documents*: The Government-Owned Entity Declaration and United Nations Sanctions Resolution, required under Forms ELI 1.1 and ELI 1.2, were not provided. The History of Non-Performing Contracts, using Form CON-2, was also missing, limiting the evaluators' ability to assess the bidder's performance history.

### 2. ABEAM Engineering

- **No valid Letter of Bid** was submitted in accordance with the official IFAD Section IV Bidding Forms. Several critical sections were either omitted or incorrectly completed, including: Bid Validity Period (inconsistent with ITB 21.1), Performance Security (altered and substituted, violating ITB 47.1), Eligibility Declaration (not in accordance with IFAD eligibility standards), Adjudicator Appointment (not correctly fulfilled under ITB 49.1).
- The bidder also *omitted mandatory declarations* in the Letter of Bid related to: Disqualification due to execution of Bid Securing Declaration by the employer, Bank-related disqualification under SEA/SH (Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment) concerns. These omissions constitute significant non-compliance with IFAD's procurement requirements.

### 3. Niguse Kidane WWGC

- **The Letter of Bid** was not in the standard form and was found to be altered, substituted, and included inappropriate content. For example, the bidder named a contractor as the Adjudicator, which violates both procedural and ethical norms.





- Critical declarations were not completed: No confirmation regarding Bank's SEA/SH disqualification.
- The form for Pending Litigation and Litigation History was improperly filled, with check boxes left unmarked or marked incorrectly, thereby failing to present accurate legal standing.
- The form for Environmental and Social Past Performance also lacked proper responses and checkboxes were not selected in the correct fields, rendering the form invalid.

These combined deficiencies indicated a lack of responsiveness to key eligibility and compliance criteria.

#### 4. Tibeb GC and WWC PLC JV with Lema Edae GC and WWC

- The Performance Security amount for Environmental and Social obligations (2%), as stated in the Letter of Bid, was incorrectly filled and below the required minimum, which violates ITB Clause 47.1.
- The section concerning commissions, gratuities, or fees was improperly completed with unnecessary or ambiguous information, instead of declaring "None" as required. This raised concerns about transparency and integrity in the bid submission.
- Such deviations from the bidding document's standard format rendered the bid non-compliant.

#### 5. Akimu Construction Engineering WWC

- **The Letter of Bid** was altered, with changes to the original wording of the bidding form, which is a direct violation of ITB Clause 15.1 that requires submission of the unaltered standard forms.
- The bidder also failed to submit: The Government-Owned Entity Declaration and the United Nations Sanctions Declaration, required in Forms ELI 1.1 and ELI 1.2. These are essential to verify the legal and eligibility status of the firm under IFAD-financed procurement.
- Due to both form alterations and missing eligibility documents, the bid was classified as non-responsive.

The above-mentioned bidders failed to meet the minimum submission, eligibility, or procedural requirements outlined in the bidding documents. The non-compliances ranged from missing or improperly filled Letters of Bid, altered bidding formats, inadequate performance securities, to omitted mandatory declarations and eligibility forms.

As a result, all seven bidders were deemed non-responsive and were excluded from further consideration in the technical evaluation stage, in accordance with the IFAD procurement framework and the terms of the Bidding Documents.

The following **seventeen (17) bidders** found to have met all preliminary requirements and therefore advanced to the Technical Evaluation stage:



#### 5.4. Remark on the Technical Evaluation

Following the detailed technical evaluation, the following twelve (12) bidders were disqualified for non-compliance with the technical requirements outlined in the bidding document. Specific justifications for each bidder's rejection are summarized below:

##### 1) Tesfaye Mosisa

- The claimed **general and specific construction** experiences were inconsistent with the company's legally established date.
- Documents for **Average Annual Construction Turnover** and **Average Annual Turnover** submitted by the Ministry of Revenue were not aligned with the trade license year (2016 EC), further supporting indications of document tampering.
- Key technical documents such as **Human Resource, Cash Flow, and Equipment** Master Schedule were not prepared or submitted using the required project software, violating submission protocols.

##### 2) Pavilion GC and WWC

- The submitted **audit report** was issued by a private auditor lacking a valid trade license, making the report invalid.
- The Environmental, Social, Health, and Safety (ESHS) Code of Conduct was not submitted, a required compliance element.
- The Equipment Master Schedule was not prepared or submitted via project software.
- Key experts including the Environmental/Climate Safeguard Specialist, Social Specialist, and Site Organizer lacked valid professional licenses, rendering the team unqualified.

##### 3) Meseret Mokoin WWC

- Audit report done by private auditor, which is not authorized auditor and became accountant this is not acceptable as per the requirement.
- **Unprofessional Scheduling:** Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule did not prepared and submitted using project software.

##### 4) Kenbon Taye WWC

- **Private Auditor's License Issue:** The private auditor's lack of trade and professional license resulted to unacceptable outcomes.
- Code of conduct: - Environmental, Social, Health and Safety (ESHS) did not submitted.
- **Unprofessional Scheduling:** Material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule did not prepared and submitted using project software.

##### 5) Phexiros Masfin JV with Relish Trading

- The bidder claimed project experience from a fictitious entity, "Engineering Corporation of Oromia", for the so-called Dodota SSIP, which amounts to fraudulent claims..





- **Unrealistic Turnover:** Average Annual construction turnover and annual turnover indicated information on letter from Ministry of Revenue Tax Payer Branch office did not coincided and unacceptable.
- **Private Auditor's License Issue:** The private auditor's lack of trade and professional license resulted to unacceptable outcomes.
- **Unprofessional Scheduling:** Material, Human Resource and Equipment Master Schedule did not prepared and submitted using project software.

#### 6) IJOO Construction

- **Lack of Experience:** General and Specific Experiences non-compliance with company establishment.
- **Unrealistic Turnover:** The Average Annual Construction Turnover and Average Annual Turnover letters from the Ministry of Revenue Tax Payer Branch office reveal noncompliance with company establishments, indicating fraud and forgery.
- **Unprofessional Scheduling:** Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule did not prepared and submitted via project software.

#### 7) Abraham Dereje GC & GCWW

- Material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule did not prepared and submitted via project software.
- **Audit Report Issue:** The audit report, which was prepared by a private auditor who was not an authorized auditor but instead became an accountant, is not acceptable according to the requirement.
- **Unsigned Expert CVs:** All CV of expert did not authorized by signature of company owner or representative.
- **Unlicensed Key Personnel:** Social Specialist and Site Organizer have not professional license.

#### 8) Worknesh Gizaw WWC

- Average construction turnover and annual turnover did not meet the minimum requirement.
- **Technical Planning Issues:** Like many others, the implementation schedule was missing proper project software formatting in Material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule.
- **Unsigned Expert CVs :** All experts CV and project manager CV did not signed by experts themselves and by authorized company owner or representative.
- **Tax Payer Evidence Issue:** Tax Payer evidence letter and document of professionals and experts not submitted and justified from custom and revenue.
- **Technical Planning Issues:** Like many others, the implementation schedule was missing proper project software formatting in Material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule
- **Unlicensed Key Personnel:** The site organizer and social expert lacked valid licenses.



**9) Kenbon Construction & Trading JV with Wak Construction & Trading PLC**

- **Lack of Joint Venture Experience:** Wak Construction failed to present general experience independently, which is mandatory in a joint venture arrangement.
- **Technical Planning Issues:** Like many others, the implementation schedule was missing proper project software formatting in Material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and Equipment Master Schedule
- **Unlicensed Key Personnel:** The site organizer and social expert lacked valid licenses.

**10) Awash Construction PLC**

- **Missing Auditor Credentials:** The audit firm did not submit a valid license.
- **Company Turnover Unfulfilled:** Average turnover not met required amount.
- **Cash Flow Scheduling Issue:** No proper software-supported schedule for cash flow master schedule.

**11) Mulunch Bekele JV with Yatani Construction PLC**

- **Incomplete Financial Access Statement:** Only one JV partner submitted cash flow data, which is noncompliant—both parties should have done so collectively.
- **Unsigned Expert CVs:** Several professionals' CVs (e.g., Forman, Social Specialist and Organizer, Environmental, Climate and Safeguard Specialist) lacked the required company representative's countersignature.
- **Expired/Doctored Professional License:** One license (office engineer) was expired and appeared to be digitally altered, raising concerns about forgery.
- **Fake Contract Agreement:** The agreement between the company and its surveyor expert was valid for only one day, which is not acceptable under any professional arrangement.

**12) Hilif Construction WWC-1 & GC-5**

- The Letter of Bid was missing key information, including the proposed Adjudicator, as required under as per ITB BDS 49.1.
- Several mandatory fields in the Letter of Bid (e.g., #14) were left blank, despite clear instructions in as per ITB 9.4 requiring bidders to complete all forms. The failure to provide all essential information constitutes non-responsiveness.





### 3.5. 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:

**Table 10: Financial evaluation results of Lot-11(WachugeSSIP)**

No	Name of the Contractors	Read out price			Price adjusted after arithmetic check			Rank
		With Out VAT	After Rebate (%)	With VAT (15%)	With Out VAT	After Rebate (%)	With VAT (15%)	
1	Fenet Gameda WWC-3	43,969,658.15		50,565,106.90	42,969,471.86		49,414,892.64	1 <sup>st</sup>
2	Burka Gemechu WWC-3	56,455,379.62		64,923,686.56	47,654,192.84		54,802,321.76	2 <sup>nd</sup>
3	SYG WWC PLC-4	65,046,503		74,803,478.45	65,046,467.58		74,803,437.72	4 <sup>th</sup>
4	Abdulaziz Umer GC	53,948,735.51		62,041,045.84	53,905,480.69		61,991,302.79	3 <sup>rd</sup>
5	Kefad Constraction	166,491,398.43		191,465,108.10	166,491,398.42		191,465,108.19	5 <sup>th</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.

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*

