

## B. Bid Evaluation

### I. Preliminary Evaluation

**Table 4: Preliminary Examination**

**Instructions:** For each bidder, indicate with "Y" (Yes) or "N" (No) if they meet the requirement. A "No" in any of columns should result in a "No" in the final "Accepted for Detailed Tech. Eval.?" column. Use the footnotes to record specific reasons for non-compliance.

**Lot No: 9-Birbirti SSIP**

S/No	Bidder's Name	Power of Attorney	Letter of Bid	Legality			Bid Security	Site Visit	Social Documents		Completeness	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for detail technical evaluation
				Constr. License	Tax Clearance	VAT Registration			ESMP	Declaration			
1	KEFAD Construction PLC	YES	NO <sup>1</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>2</sup>	YES	YES	NO	NO
2	Elili GC JV with Wada Engineering PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
3	Pillar Engineering & Trading PLC	NO <sup>3</sup>	NO <sup>4</sup>	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>5</sup>	NO <sup>6</sup>	NO <sup>7</sup>	YES	YES	NO	NO

<sup>1</sup> Even though 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 did not state it.

The bidder stated about environmental and social impact and mitigation measures which not site related. The intended site is irrigation site using gravity while bidder described impact related to water supply (more on Pipe line, alkalization, ground water decrease, soil acidity due to pipe installed, poor water quality).

There is no matrix submitted the bidder even though Even though qualification criteria under 5.6 requirement state "Environmental, social (including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and gender-based violence (GBV), health and safety plans should be prepared with Matrix should be submitted by the bidder Letter of bid is signed by other person even though power of attorney was given properly.

Letter of bid submitted by the bidder has blank space which violet ITB 15.1 and adjudicator is not accepted regardless of ITB 14.4

<sup>5</sup> Even though the bid security should remain valid for the period of 28 days beyond original validity period, according to ITB 22 (e), the bidder submitted bid security which is valid for 90 days only (original validity period)

<sup>6</sup> The bidder did not submit site visit letter and report

<sup>7</sup> There are no identified potential social and environmental impacts with mitigation measures (Matrix) submitted by the bidder but requested under evaluation Criteria 5.6.

S/No	Bidder's Name	Power of Attorney	Letter of Bid	Legality			Bid Security	Site Visit	Social Documents		Completeness	Substantial Responses	Accepted for detail technical evaluation
				Constr. License	Tax Clearance	VAT Registration			ESMP	Declaration			
4	Elicon General Construction	NO <sup>8</sup>	NO <sup>9</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
5	Tadesse Benti WWC& GC JV with Asefa Kebede WWC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
6	Tesema Dereje GWWC	NO <sup>10</sup>	NO <sup>11</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>12</sup>	YES	YES	NO	NO
7	GGC General Contractor PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
8	Abebe Negash GC	YES	NO <sup>13</sup>	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>14</sup>	YES	YES	NO <sup>15</sup>	YES	NO	NO
9	Ifa Ijan General Construction PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>16</sup>	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
10	Tutad GC PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
11	Equatorial Construction PLC JV with BIGETA Business PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
12	Dedefo Tenesho GC & WWC JV with SHOODEB Engineering PLC	NO <sup>17</sup>	YES	YES	NO <sup>18</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO

<sup>8</sup> Power of attorney declaration is not signed which fails to ITB 14.1 (e), which say “written confirmation authorizing signature....”

<sup>9</sup> Letter of bid submitted by the bidder is altered and not as per as IFAD standard even though ITB 15.1 says “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**”

<sup>10</sup> Power of attorney declaration is written for another site, stating Darimu Woreda, which is far from Birbirti SSIP location

<sup>11</sup> Letter of bid submitted by the bidder is altered and not as per as IFAD standard regardless of ITB 15.1

<sup>12</sup> The bidder did not submit description of possible impacts due to the construction with mitigation measures matrix which fails for qualification criteria of 5.6

<sup>13</sup> The bidder did not submit letter of bid and other formats. But ITB 9.4 state that “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**”

<sup>14</sup> The Bid Security submitted by the bidder is conditional while requirement set for bid security should be in the form of unconditional and irrevocable

<sup>15</sup> There is no submitted ESH Declaration as ES-3 form by the bidder, but the bidder is required to submit all forms according ITB 9.4

<sup>16</sup> Site Visit submitted by the bidder wrongly name the project. Name of project is “birbirti” while the bidder stated it as “Gemechis”. And also, location of the project is not properly written for the bidder interchange zone and woreda. The name of the bidder is not written properly on the site visit format.

<sup>17</sup> Each JV gave power of attorney differently for different person instead of giving one person on the behalf of the two

<sup>18</sup> Tax Clearance for SHODEB is expired

S/No	Bidder's Name	Power of Attorney	Letter of Bid	Legality			Bid Security	Site Visit	Social Documents		Completeness	Substantial Responsiveness	Accepted for detail technical evaluation
				Constr. License	Tax Clearance	VAT Registration			ESMP	Declaration			
13	FAMCO Engineering PLC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
14	Solomon Kebede WWC	YES	NO <sup>19</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>20</sup>	YES	YES	NO	NO
15	Yonas Dugo GWWC	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>21</sup>	NO <sup>22</sup>	NO <sup>23</sup>	YES	NO	NO
16	Addisu Yeshawawork GC	YES	NO <sup>24</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO <sup>25</sup>	YES	YES	NO	NO
17	AICH Trading	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
18	Million Retta GC	YES	NO <sup>26</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
19	Excellence Electro Mechanical Installation and maintenance PLC	YES	NO <sup>27</sup>	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO

<sup>19</sup> The letter of bid is not as per as IFAD standard even though the bidder should submit all required forms in section IV according to ITB 15.1

<sup>20</sup> The bidder stated impacts related to environmental and social in general, no matrix, not site specific while qualification criteria 5.6. require site specific and in matrix form

No project name described in site visit. Even though the project is located in West Hararge, the bidder stated as it locates in East Hararge in site visit report

The bidder submitted negative impact of the project to environment and social with mitigation measures, but no responsible body set for the action. For ES Declaration (ES-3 form) the bidder submitted declaration used by Bank not IFAD

<sup>24</sup> There is no name of Adjudicator listed in letter of bid regardless of the requirement under ITB 14.4

<sup>25</sup> The bidder did not describe site specific impacts with their mitigation and responsible body to mitigate which fails to meet qualification criteria under 5.6

<sup>26</sup> Letter of bid is altered and not in full content which fails for ITB 15.1

<sup>27</sup> The bidder used two letters of bid which one is not as per as required by IFAD and totally changed and idea alteration. The second one is as per as IFAD Standard but not filled properly for #5, about discount and #19 about acceptance of appointed adjudicator.



*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*

### C. Technical Evaluation Summary

#### 1. Evaluation Overview


- Total Bids Received: 19
- Preliminary Examination Passed: 7
- Technically Qualified: 4
- Technically Rejected: 3

#### 2. Technically Qualified Bidders

S/No	Bidder's Name	Technical Status	Key Strengths	Compliant (Y/N)
1	Elili GC JV with Wada Engineering	Fully Compliant	Financial Capacity, having equipment and work experience	YES
2	GGC General Contractor PLC	Fully Compliant	Financial Capacity, having equipment and work experience	YES
3	Equatorial Construction Plc JV with Bigeta Business	Fully Compliant	Financial Capacity, having Machine and work experience	YES
4	Tutad GC PLC	Fully Compliant	Financial Capacity, having Machine and work experience	YES

#### 3. Technically Rejected Bidders & Reasons

S/No	Bidder's Name	Primary Reason for Rejection	Specific non-compliance
1	Tadesse Benti WWC & GC JV with Asefa Kebede WWC	Annual Construction Turnover	Submitted under requirement
		Misleading	Submitted single project named as Haro Kamise in different zones (Jimma and Buno Bedele)
2	FAMCO Engineering PLC	Schedule	Submitted only work/activity schedule regardless of submitting other schedules such as material, human resource and equipment schedules
		Personal	Mismatch information CV/Resume and credential document for department, level of degree, university, graduation year. This is considered as false information which leads to misleading the committee
3	AICH Trading	Annual Construction Turnover	Submitted under requirement
		Work Methodology	The bidder stated methodology for dam which is not site specific



#### 4. Price Evaluation for Technically Qualified Bidders

S/No	Bidder Name	Currency	Submitted/ Read-out bid price(s) with VAT	Arithmetic Correction / Difference	Adjust ment (%)	Evaluated bid price with VAT	Rank
1	Elili GC JV with Wada Engineering PLC	ETB	172,837,778.67	475,852.11	0.27%	172,361,926.56	2 <sup>nd</sup>
2	GGC General Contractor PLC	ETB	214,539,456.93	13,607,839.9	6.3%	200,931,617.03	3 <sup>rd</sup>
3	Equatorial Construction Plc JV with Bigeta Business	ETB	207,834,116.22	170,583.5	0.03%	208,004,699.72	4 <sup>th</sup>
4	Tutad GC PLC	ETB	140,614,184.67	627,135.74	0.45%	139,987,048.93	1 <sup>st</sup>



## **H. Final Endorsement**

Based on the comprehensive evaluation documented in this report, the Evaluation Committee unanimously reaffirms its recommendation to award the contract for **Lot-9: Birbirti SSIP to Elili GC JV with Wada Engineering PLC** for a final corrected total price of **ETB 172,361,926.56 (One Hundred Seventy-Two Million Three Hundred Sixty-One Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Six and 56/100)**.