

Part B: Bid Evaluation

Table 4: Preliminary Examination - Compliance Checklist

Instructions: For each bidder, indicate with "Y" (Yes) or "N" (No) if they meet the requirement or Not.

Lot 11. Burka Sodu SSIP

Bidder No.	Bidder Name	Authorization & Formalities	Legality (Trade License, construction license)	Bid Security	Site Visit	Enviro./Social Document	Completeness of Bid	Letter of bid	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for Detailed Tech. Evaluation?
1	Bargamo Construction PLC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2	AICHI Trading	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y



[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten mark]

Bidder No.	Bidder Name	Authorization & Formalities	Legality (Trade License, construction license)	Bid Security	Site Visit	Enviro./Social Document	Completeness of Bid	Letter of bid	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for Detailed Tech. Evaluation?
	Addisu Yeshewawork GWWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N ¹	Y	N ²	N	N
4	Nimona GC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N ³	Y	N ⁴	N	N

¹ The Environmental and Social (ES) documents submitted by the bidder are neither signed nor prepared in the required detail (evaluation criteria 5.6). As a result, the documents are not properly authenticated by the bidder and do not conform to the prescribed submission requirements.

² Incomplete letter of bid. The bidder failed to fill in all the required the requested information. In accordance with ITB 15.1, the Letter of Bid form must be completed without any alteration to the text and all blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested. the bidder did not furnish the name of a proposed adjudicator as required under ITB Clause 14.4. In addition, the bidder failed to fill in the sections relating to the Environmental Performance Security and the Performance Security. Accordingly, the Letter of Bid was submitted with incomplete mandatory information and does not fully comply with the requirements of the Bidding Document.

³ The bidder did not prepare a the assessment of the potential positive and negative environmental and social impacts of the proposed works, nor did it propose appropriate mitigation measures. In addition, the assessment was not prepared in the required manner . Therefore, the submission does not comply with Evaluation Criterion 5.6 and fails to adequately address the environmental and social requirements of the bidding document.

⁴ The bidder filled the bid price field in the Letter of Bid as "None." This is not in-compliance with ITB 15.1, which requires all blank spaces to be completed with the requested information, including the bid price.

Bidder No.	Bidder Name	Authorization & Formalities	Legality (Trade License, construction license)	Bid Security	Site Visit	Enviro./Social Document	Completeness of Bid	Letter of bid	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for Detailed Tech. Evaluation?
5	Lami Garedew GWWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6	Divine Horizon Construction one person plc JV with Tafcon Engineering & trading	N ⁵	Y	Y	Y	N ⁶	Y	N ⁷	N	N

⁵ No authorization confirmation letter was submitted. According to Clause ITB 23.1, the bidder shall authorize the person who signs the bid on behalf of the bidder

⁶ The Environmental and Social (ES) documents submitted by the bidder are unsigned and therefore not properly authenticated. Consequently, the submission does not comply with Evaluation Criterion 5.6. In addition, the documents were submitted by a single entity instead of as a Joint Venture (JV) as required by the bidding documents.

⁷ Incomplete letter of bid. The bidder failed to fill in all requested information (Discount, Adjudicator, bid price). In accordance with ITB 15.1, the Letter of Bid form must be completed without any alteration to the text and all blank spaces shall be filled in with the information requested.

Bidder No.	Bidder Name	Authorization & Formalities	Legality (Trade License, construction license)	Bid Security	Site Visit	Enviro./Social Document	Completeness of Bid	Letter of bid	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for Detailed Tech. Evaluation?
7	CCG Engineering	Y	Y	Y	Y	N ⁸	Y	N ⁹	N	N
8	Ifa Ijan WWC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	Solid Stone Construction	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

⁸ The bidder failed to submit the Environmental and Social (ES) documents of the project in accordance with the requirements specified in the bidding documents (evaluation criteria 5.6)

⁹ The bidder filled the in the Letter of Bid with unrelated information. Specifically, the “Adjudicator” assigned by the client in the Bid Data Sheet (ITB clause 49.1) was indicated as “Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce” but bidder fill, “Construction of SSIP.” In addition, the bid validity period stated in the Letter of Bid has already expired.

Technical Evaluation Summary

1. EVALUATION OVERVIEW

- Total Bids Received: Nine(9)
- Preliminary Examination Passed: Five(5)
- Technically Qualified: Three(3)
- Technically Rejected: Two(2)

2. TECHNICALLY QUALIFIED BIDDERS

No.	Bidder Name	Technical Status	Key Strengths	Compliant (Y/N)
1	Bergamo Construction	Fully Compliant	high specific experience, meets the financial requirements, and complete documentation that fulfills the required equipment and manpower criteria	Y
2	Ifa Ijan WWC	Fully Compliant	Adequate experience and financial, full personnel and equipment	Y
3	Lemi Geradow GWWC	Fully Compliant	Adequate experience and financial, full personnel and equipment	Y

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten signature]



3. TECHNICALLY REJECTED BIDDERS & REASONS

Bidder Name	Primary Reason for Rejection	Specific Non-Compliance
AICHI Trading	Turnover	Average annual turnover of 32mmillion ETB is below the required 60 million ETB.
Solid stone Construction PLC	Turnover, experience, equipment	Average annual turnover and experience of the bidder didn't meet the minimum requirement and missing equipment



Price Evaluation for Technically Qualified Bidders

No.	Bidder Name	Currency(ies) of bid	Submitted/ Read-out bid price(s) with VAT 15%	Arithmetic Correction / Difference	Adjustment (e.g., for non-conformities)	Evaluated bid price with VAT 15%	Rank
1	Bergamo Construction	ETB	120,803,944.51	17,438,010.06	(14%)	103,365,948.84	1 st
2	Lemi Geradow GWWC	ETB	114,547,033.4	75,948.26	0.07%	114,471,085.16	2 nd (recommended)
3	Ifa Ijan WWC	ETB	156,913,312.72	19,825,396.71	(12.6%)	137,087,916.01	3 rd

Recommendation: Based on the evaluation above, **Bergamo Construction** is the **lowest evaluated substantially responsive bidder** but the **bidder** is recommended for lot-5 kuri ganda umaro after comparing financial differences with second financial evaluated bidder of lot-5 and lot-11. According to the bidding document multiple lot award is not recommended. Therefore, **Lemi Geradow GWWC** is recommended for lot-11 Burka Sodü.

Recommended Bidder for Contract Award

Final Endorsement: Based on the comprehensive evaluation documented in this report, the Evaluation Committee unanimously **reaffirms its recommendation to award the contract for Lot-11 Burka sodu SSIP to Lami Geredow GWWC** for a final corrected total price of **ETB 114,471,085.16** (One hundred Fourteen million, Four hundred seventy-one thousand, eighty-Five birr and sixteen cents).