

Points of Rejection during Preliminary Evaluation

1. FY Bonsa GWWC

- ✦ Even though ITB 23.1, the authorized person or persons signing the bid shall initial all pages of the bid where entries and amendments have been made, the bidder did not sign on bidding document.
- ✦ ***Regardless of ITB 15.1, which indicate*** “The letter of bid and schedules, including the bills of quantities (or activity schedule) and technical offer information, shall be prepared using the relevant forms furnished in Section IV, **Bidding Forms**. **These forms must be completed without any alterations to its text, and no substitutes shall be accepted. All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested**”, the bidder did not use letter of bid formatted in bidding forms.
- ✦ And didn't fill forms too.

2. IJOO Construction

- ✦ Bidder stated only 2% performance security which deviates from ITB 47.1 (“In addition to the performance security, the employer also requires the successful bidder to present an environmental and social performance Security. The cumulative value of both performance securities shall not exceed 10 % (8% performance and 2% E&S).
- ✦ The bidder did not describe the specific work/project he/she is going to execute under letter of bid (#3).
- ✦ Letter of bid and declaration of Power of attorney are also not signed
- ✦ The bidder used to submit expired letter of tax clearance

3. Hortu GC PLC JV with Belete Megersa WWGC

- ✦ Joint venture agreement is not verified by 3rd party, or even no witnesses
- ✦ The bid document is also stamped by single party instead of having the two parties
- ✦ Declared Power of attorney is not signed and also not representative of the two parties (Single Stamped).



4. Najaha Ahimed Abdukerim WWC

- ✦ Despite of ITB 15.1 which states that “All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested”, the bidder submitted unfilled letter of bid (#4, 5, 6). The bidder is expected to examine all **instructions, forms, terms, and works requirements** in this bidding document. **Failure to furnish all information** or documentation required by this bidding document may result in the *rejection of the bid* (ITB 9.4)

- ✦ The bidder did not use correct Procurement reference number

5. ABEAM Engineering

- ✚ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not use letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted in section IV.

6. Tesfaye Mosisa GC

- ✚ In Bid Data Sheet 47.1, the employer proposed *Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce* as Adjudicator. But the bidder stated project/work as Adjudicator. Since the name of the potential *adjudicator* proposed by the employer in **ITB BDS 49.1** and by the bidder (letter of bid) shall be subject to *IFAD's no-objection* (ITB 14.4), the bidder required to either accept the proposed adjudicator or set his/her other option instead.
- ✚ The bidder's trade license on hardcopy and online from e-trade is contradicted. According to Online date the bidder has no five-year experience and not so, not eligible

11:06 AM

የገንዘብ አስተዳደር ቢሮ

አዲስ አበባ

የገንዘብ ምዝገባ

የተመዘገበበት ቁጥር
AR/AA/1/0012421/2016

የኅብር ክፍያ መለያ ቁጥር
0086488489

የድርጅት / የኃላፊው ስም
ተስፋዬ ሞሴል ገመዱ

የድርጅት / የኃላፊው ስም በእንግሊዝኛ
TESFAYE MOSISA GEMEDA

ህጋዊ አጽም
ክርታል
1000000

የተመዘገበበት ቀን
15/1/2016

ስራ እስኪያጀ



ተስፋዬ ሞሴል



Reasons of rejection of the 5 bidders are listed as follows:

1. YE WWC

- ✦ The bidder is licensed 2023, which lead him less experienced than required year, 5 years
- ✦ The bidder submitted only one year audit report while 5 years audit report
- ✦ Agreement of project manager, construction Forman has no agreement year interval
- ✦ The agreement of Equipment Proposed for the work between the contractor and leased part has no contractor's stamp.

2. Wada Engineering JV with Getachew Gudisa GC

- ✦ Audit report for Getachew Gudisa GC is only for 3 years, and is done by unknown auditor
- ✦ Even though master (activity Schedule) should show works/ activities and time needed to complete, the bidder submitted Construction schedule which has no work description
- ✦ According **Section -3 Bid Examination, Evaluation** must meet criteria set on 5.5, general work methodologies will not be valid unless specific to the site. But the bidder submitted methodology which is not site specific.
- ✦ And also must meet criteria under 5.5 (a) require Site Visit report and verification letter from the district. The bidder submitted site visit letter approved by zone, and has no report.

3. Leta Tefera GWWC

- ✦ The bidder's financial situation is audited by auditor who was licensed 2013/2021, but the auditor used to audit starting from 2020, which is prior to his licensing year.
- ✦ Auditor is required to be authorized and authenticated auditor, but the bidder used authorized accountant.



Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten number 7 in blue ink.



የተመዘገበበት ቁጥር
 ORO/Nt/C2/1/0002142/2013
 የግብር ክፋይ መለያ ቁጥር
 0011450173
 የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም
 አሸም ቱኔ ሳዶ
 የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም በእንግሊዝኛ
 ASHIM TUNE SADO
 ህጋዊ እድም
 ግለሰብ ነጋዴ
 ካፒታል
 16229
 የተመዘገበበት ቀን
 3/10/2013

ስራ አስኪያጅ



አሸም ቱኔ
 ASHIM TUNE

- ✦ No Material Flow Master Schedule, Equipment Resources Master Schedule
- ✦ The agreement date between the office Engineer and the contractor was signed on 15/02/2017 but the agreement is signed for 15/02/2015-15/02/2017 E.C
- ✦ Site visit letter does not state the contractor or representative

4. Nehemia Engineering PLC

- ✦ The bidder is licensed on 2014 E.C/2021 GC, but the bidder submitted project construction experience from 2020 GC and specific experience, General experience and average annual turnover not meet the requirement, which is not logical
- ✦ There is no construction and equipment schedule
- ✦ Code of conduct is not stated as per as required
- ✦ Project Manager has no professional license



72

6

7

0

10:39 AM

የኢትዮጵያ ፌዴራላዊ ዲሞክራሲያዊ ሪፐብሊክ



አዋጅ ቁጥር

የግንባታ ምዝገባ

የተመዘገበበት ቁጥር

AK/AA/2/0013545/2014

የግብር ከፋይ መለያ ቁጥር

0075184647

የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም

ህጻን ሊንግዊስቲክ ምረቃ የተወሰነ የግል ማህበር

የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም በእንግሊዝኛ

NEHEMIA ENGINEERING PLC

ህጋዊ አቋም

ክፍል

1000000

የተመዘገበበት ቀን

26/1/2014

ስራ አስኪያጅ



የተሳሰለ ስም

5. Kanenus WWC PLC

- ✦ The bidder has no intended Construction turnover amount
- ✦ There is no letter of evidence from Ministry of Revenue for construction annual average turnover
- ✦ Code of conduct is not well stated
- ✦ Experience given for Project manager is overlapped and also Letter of experience written has no reference number.
- ✦ The bidder proposed office engineer having only graduate professional license while the document acquire about 6 years work experience
- ✦ The bidder submitted only one dewatering pump instead of two.



4.1.3. Financial Comparison

S/N	Bidders Name	Currency	Submitted Readout with Vat	Corrected Arithmetic with VAT	Rank
1	KEFAD Construction PLC	ETB	53,980,397.30	68,944,944.79	2 nd
2	Boni Construction PLC	ETB	29,958,157.70	26,998,362.83	1 st

Recommendation for Evaluation

Accordingly, **Boni Construction PLC** has been recommended as the lowest evaluated bidder for the construction of **Dire Hara SSIP** with an amount of **26,998,362.83** (Twenty-Six Million Nine Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Three Hundred Sixty-Two and 83/100) with 15% VAT.



Points of Rejection during Preliminary Evaluation

1. Niguse Kidane WWC

- ✦ Since the letter of bid is not as per as IFAD format and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements. Therefore, for letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not use letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted

2. MET Metal Engineering Work PLC

- ✦ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not use letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted, the bidder not intended format of letter of bid as per as IFAD format and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements.

3. Daniel Tamere GWWC JV SHODEB Engineering

- ✦ Since the letter of bid is not as per as IFAD format and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements
- ✦ There is no 3rd party that certified or approved JV agreement of the two parties
- ✦ For JV, bid document should be stamped by the two parties to show their joint willingness. But the there is only single stamp on the bid document
- ✦ Power of attorney is expected to be on the behalf of the two parties, but the declaration given for the power of attorney is not as intended.
- ✦ Bidder submitted expired tax clearance

4. Gammachuu Mallkamu GC

- ✦ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not use letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted, the bidder not intended format of letter of bid as per as IFAD format and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements



5. Bereket Eshetu GC

- ✦ The employer ordered the bidders to submit one original and two copies of both technical and financial proposals on Bid Data sheet. But, the bidder submitted only single copy which leads incomplete document submission
- ✦ Opposite to bidder needed that has no nonperforming history, pending litigation, the bidder stated that, his company has history of nonperforming and litigation history too on bidding forms.
- ✦ The bidder also not use correct procurement reference number and adjudicator

6. Berhanu Bekele GWWC

- ✦ Since the letter of bid is not as per as IFAD format and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements
- ✦ Environmental and social S declaration is not complete



Reasons of rejection of the 5 bidders are listed as follows:

1. Nehemia Engineering PLC

- ✦ Average annual turnover is under desired amount
- ✦ Project Manager has no professional license
- ✦ Positive and negative impact of construction on ES is not articulated
- ✦ Construction methodology is not site specific
- ✦ All schedule is not clear and as standard
- ✦ No cost breakdown presented

2. Yatani Construction Engineering

- ✦ Even though there is audit report, the auditor's trade license, VAT register and Tax payer is not attached to identify his/her eligibility
- ✦ Turnover is below intended amount
- ✦ Site visit is not certified by woreda/kebele, and the bidder has not present site visit report
- ✦ ESHS is prepared for road construction, not for Imiru SSIP
- ✦ Environmental, social (including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and gender-based violence (GBV), health and safety plans was not prepared with Matrix

3. WADA Engineering PLC

- ✦ Project Management has no specific experience, and also has general experience under requirement years
- ✦ Social Specialist and site organizer has irrelevant academic profession.
- ✦ Schedule of work, material, Human Resource, Cash Flow and equipment is not appropriate and not as standard

4. Boni Construction PLC

- ✦ Average annual construction turnover is under requirement

5. Yeshak Abebe GC

- ✦ Average annual construction turnover is under requirement and certified payment of the executed construction work is not attached.
- ✦ Professional license of Environmental, Climate & Safeguard Specialist is not renewed(the year of renewed is unknown)
- ✦ ESH matrix that describes positive and negative impact of the project on environment and social with necessary mitigation measures is not submitted.



4.2.3. Financial Comparison

S/N	Bidders Name	Currency	Submitted Readout with Vat	Corrected Arithmetic with Vat	Rank
1	Kenbon Construction and Trading	ETB	146,799,584.51	152,802,585.40	1 st
2	Equatorial Construction PLC	ETB	241,444,384.82	168,734,959.34	2 nd

Recommendation for Evaluation

Accordingly, **Kenbon Construction and Trading** has been recommended as the lowest evaluated bidder for construction of **Imiru SSIP** with an amount of **152,802,585.40** (One Hundred Fifty-Two Million Eight Hundred Two Thousand Five Hundred Eighty-Five and 40/100) with 15% VAT.



Points of Rejection during Preliminary Evaluation

1. Kalacha Construction PLC AB

- ✦ Letter of bid is not as per IFAD standard and not complete(1,2,5,14,14 &19) and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks and so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and bank's SEA requirements SEA requirements.

2. FY Bonsa GWWC

- ✦ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not submit letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted, so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements.
- ✦ The bidder not signed on each page of the bidding document.

3. Burka Robe JV with Habib Hussen Mohammed

- ✦ The bidder submitted proposal which lack completeness since the bidder submitted only one copy of financial proposal.
- ✦ Even though adjudicator on letter of bid of bidder and bid data sheet should be aligned, the bidder didn't state either to accept or not.
- ✦ All blank spaces on Letter of bid should be filled properly and used without any alteration, the bidder submitted incomplete letter of bid (un filled black spaces)

4. Dedefo Tenesho GC &WWC JV with Shodeb Engineering

- ✦ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not use letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted, the bidder not filled other intended formats
- ✦ There is power attorney declaration, but the person authorized to sign the document didn't sign at all necessary parts

5. Walif Construction S.C

- ✦ Letter of bid used by the bidder is not one required by IFAD which leads
- ✦ Even the letter used stated another project work while the bidder is submitted for Hamsiso SSIP works



6. Bekele Burusa GC & WWC

- ✦ Despite of ITB 15.1 which states that "All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested", the bidder submitted unfilled some blank spaces The bidder is expected to examine all **instructions, forms, terms, and works requirements** in this bidding document. **Failure to furnish all information** or documentation required by this bidding document may result in the *rejection of the bid* (ITB 9.4)
- ✦ The bidder's license is blocked and not renewed.

3:54 PM

4G 47.2 K/s

የገንዘብ ፈቃድ
የፈቃድ ቁጥር
04/451/04/3399/2007
የገንዘብ ስም
በቀለ ቡሩሳ ጉርሙ
ካፒታል
70952
የጸደቀበት ቀን
8/6/2011
ጸደቀበት የሚያገለግለው
8/6/2011 - 30/10/2011
ያለበት ሁኔታ
⚠ ታግዷል
የታገደበት ምክንያት አሳይ
የተመዘገበበት ቀን
11/2/2007

አድራሻ
ክልል
አሮሚያ
ዞን
አዳማ ከተማ
ክፍለ ከተማ/ወረዳ
ባለ



7. Gemechu Admasu WWC JV with Tewdros Admasu WWC

- ✦ Even though letter of bid is one of document attached to contract agreement of responsive bidder, the bidder did not submit letter of bid as per as required by IFAD and formatted, so there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and banks SEA requirements.

8. Gadisa Jetu GC & WWC

- ✦ The bidder did not IFAD required letter of bid and there is no declaration of conflict of interest, suspension, IFAD eligibility and bank's SEA requirements.



Reasons of rejection of the 4 bidders are listed as follows:

1. United Construction PLC

- ✦ Since the bidder has not submitted certified Payment received for all construction (only agreement and provisional handover), it is impossible to estimate the bidder's average annual construction turnover
- ✦ There is no site specific matrix of ESMP
- ✦ No submitted Material and Cash flow schedule

2. Feyisa Guteta GC

- ✦ Trade license registration on hard copy and online (e-trade) is different.
- ✦ Bidder is licensed on 2015, but submitted construction experience, which is prior to being licensed, 2013

9:45 AM 4 8 10. 20.11.2015

አማርኛ ደንብ

የተመዘገበበት ቁጥር
ORO/WSH/AMBT/1/0007996/2015

የግብር ከፋይ መለያ ቁጥር
0079134619

የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም
ፋይሳ ጉታታ ሳቦቃ

የድርጅት / የግለሰብ ስም በእንግሊዝኛ
FEYISA GUTETA SOBOKA

ህጋዊ እድገት
ግለሰብ ነጋዴ

ካፒታል
200000

የተመዘገበበት ቀን
24/5/2015

ስራ እስኪያጅ



ፋይሳ ጉታታ
FEYISA GUTETA

- ✦ The bidder did not submitted master schedule done by project soft wares.
- ✦ Project Manager proposed by the bidder has no intended experience.



3. Zemenay Gasheye GC

- ✦ Auditor has used Trade license for the 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 renewed for the year 2016 only
- ✦ The amount of average annual turnover listed on the letter written from revenue is less than required amount
- ✦ The bidder submitted code of conduct in the name of another contractor (KEFAD on No. 4)
- ✦ professional license is renewed for 2013, not for this year
- ✦ the bidder has only one site engineer instead of 2 required
- ✦ There is only one Forman instead of 3 required
- ✦ The bidder has only two trucks, but 3 trucks are desired

4. Zewdu Lema GC

- ✦ Auditor's Trade license is not renewed for all years
- ✦ Average annual turnover of the bidder does not meet the required amount
- ✦ No Cost Break Down (Detailed Breakdown of labor, equipment cost) in the tender document.
- ✦ Professional license of Environmental, Climate & Safeguard Specialist is given from construction Authority.
- ✦ Taxpayer format for key personnel's has no stamp of revenue administration office.



[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

4.3.3. Financial Comparison

S/N	Bidders Name	Currency	Submitted Readout with Vat	Corrected Arithmetic with Vat	Rank
1	Kenbon Construction & Trading	ETB	180,135,181.39	180,135,226,60	2 nd
2	Equatorial Construction PLC	ETB	126,708,577.08	226,708,703.10	3 rd
3	Hasen Hawes GC	ETB	124,929,217.49	139,630,954.97	1 st

Recommendation for evaluation

Accordingly, **Hasen Hawes GC** has been recommended as the lowest evaluated bidder for construction of **Hamsiso SSIP** with an amount of ETB **139,630,954.97** (One Hundred Thirty-Nine Million Six Hundred Thirty Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty-Four and 97/100) with 15% VAT.



Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Handwritten signature in blue ink.

Points of Rejection during Preliminary Evaluation

1. Adugna Ejigu GC

- ✦ Adjudicator on letter of bid is not as per as required
- ✦ The bidder didn't have declaration of ES and Nonperforming history, Pending Litigation, and other formats

2. Hilif Construction

- ✦ Despite of ITB 15.1 which states that "All blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested", the bidder submitted unfilled letter of bid (#14). The bidder is expected to examine all **instructions, forms, terms, and works requirements** in this bidding document. **Failure to furnish all information** or documentation required by this bidding document may result in the *rejection of the bid* (ITB 9.4)
- ✦ In Bid Data Sheet 47.1, the employer proposed **Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce** as Adjudicator. But the bidder stated project/work as Adjudicator. Since the name of the potential *adjudicator* proposed by the employer in **ITB BDS 49.1** and by the bidder (letter of bid) shall be subject to *IFAD's no-objection* (ITB 14.4), the bidder required to either accept the proposed adjudicator or set his/her other option instead

3. Tibe WWC JV Lema Idae

- ✦ Letter of bid--- Security guarantee of Environmental and Social is 1% which is under requirement.
- ✦ Power of Attorney is given for another project (Wachuge SSIP)



Four handwritten signatures in blue ink are located at the bottom of the page, below the stamp. The signatures are stylized and vary in length and shape.

Reasons of rejection of the 4 bidders are listed as follows:

1. United Construction PLC

- ✦ Since the bidder has not submitted certified Payment received for all construction (only agreement and provisional handover), it is impossible to estimate the bidder's average annual construction turnover
- ✦ No submitted Material and Cash flow schedule
- ✦ Project Manager, office Engineer and site Engineer agreement date is expired, it is (27/5/2017-30/5/2017 E.C)

2. Tulema WWC

- ✦ Average Annual Construction turnover is below the required amount.



4.4.3. Financial Comparison

S/N	Bidders Name	Currency	Submitted Readout with Vat	Corrected Arithmetic with Vat	Rank
1	SYG WWC PLC	ETB	58,723,163.00	58,723,119	1 st
2	Raba Engineering PLC	ETB	72,928,060.64	69,918,485	2 nd

Recommendation for Evaluation

Accordingly, **SYG WWC PLC** has been recommended as the lowest evaluated bidder for the construction of **Ogile SSIP** with an amount of **58,723,119** (Fifty-Eight Million Seven Hundred Twenty-Three Thousand One Hundred Nineteen) with 15%VAT.



Handwritten signatures and initials in blue ink at the bottom of the page.