

#### INTENTION TO AWARD A CONTRACT

## (Also published in terms of section 45(3)(b) of the Public Procurement Act No. 7 of 2011 on the public procurement website: <u>www.sppra.co.sz</u>)

DATE OF FIRST PUBLICATION OF THIS NOTICE	31 August 2023
TENDER NO	EWSC 64 OF 2022/2023
NAME OF TENDER	CONSTRUCTION OF GUARD HOUSES FOR DIFFERENT SITES
APPROVALS AUTHORITY	Eswatini Water Services Corporation
PROCURING ENTITY	Eswatini Water Services Corporation
REQUESTING ENTITY	Eswatini Water Services Corporation

In terms of section 45 of the Public Procurement Act No. 7 of 2011 (the Act), following a competitive bidding process, notice is hereby given that a contract award decision for the above cited tender has been reached by the approvals authority as follows:

### **CENTRAL REGION**

DETAILS OF BEST EVALUATED RESPON	SIVE TENDERER FOR CENTRAL REGION		
NAME	NTSIKA YETFU INVESTMENTS		
NATIONALITY	SWATI		
PROPOSED CONTRACT PRICE	<b>SZL 1,862,015.19</b> (One Million, Eight Hundred and Sixty-Two Thousand and Fifteen Emalangeni, Nineteen Cents) Inclusive of VAT & CIC levy		
TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE	Best Responsive and Competitive Tenderer		

DETAILS OF ALL OTHER UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS			
NAME	NATIONALITY	EVALUATED BID PRICE	REASON FOR DISQUALIFICATION
Malwakhe	Swati	SZL1,935,354.85	Higher bid price compared to that of
Construction		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	



	1		1
Muzo Investment	Swati	SZL 3,924,292.90	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Channah	Swati	SZL 2,154,832.13	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Bluewave Civils	Swati	SZL 2,975,885.44	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
H-Devine	Swati	SZL 3,435,469.18	Higher bid price compared to that of
Contractors		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Palm Tree (Pty)	Swati	SZL 2,190,374.56	Higher bid price compared to that of
Ltd		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Innovator	Swati	SZL 2,776,348.19	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investments		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
My Turn	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
Dokas Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
Pincus	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
CNX	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Construction			
SR & GZ Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
of Companies			
Fakumfutfo	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Mabhe	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			1997 - 1997 1997 - 1997

## NORTHWEST REGION

DETAILS OF BEST EVALUATED RESPON	ISIVE TENDERER FOR PHOPHONYANE WTP
NAME	Malwakhe Construction
NATIONALITY	SWATI
PROPOSED CONTRACT PRICE	SZL 1,925,354.85 (One Million, Nine Hundred and Twenty-Five Thousand, Three Hundred and Fifty-Four Emalangeni, Eighty-Five Cents) Inclusive of VAT & CIC levy
TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE	Best Responsive and Competitive Tenderer

# DETAILS OF ALL OTHER UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS



NAME	NATIONALITY	EVALUATED BID PRICE	REASON FOR DISQUALIFICATION
Ntsika Yetfu	Swati	SZL1,987,471.53	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Muzo Investment	Swati	SZL 3,924,292.90	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Channah	Swati	SZL 2,154,832.13	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Bluewave Civils	Swati	SZL 2,975,885.44	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
H-Devine	Swati	SZL 3,435,469.18	Higher bid price compared to that of
Contractors		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Palm Tree (Pty)	Swati	SZL 2,190,374.56	Higher bid price compared to that of
Ltd		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Innovator	Swati	SZL 2,776,348.19	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investments		(VAT Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
My Turn	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			104 07
Dokas Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			, Lu v (346)
Pincus	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
CNX	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Construction			
SR & GZ Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
of Companies			
Fakumfutfo	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Mabhe	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			

# EAST REGION

.

DETAILS OF BEST EVALUATED RESPON	SIVE TENDERER FOR HLATIKHULU WTP
NAME	Palm Tree (Pty) Ltd
NATIONALITY	SWATI
PROPOSED CONTRACT PRICE	<b>SZL 675,527.12</b> (Six Hundred and Seventy-Five Thousand, Five hundred and Twenty-Seven Emalangeni and Twelve Cents) Inclusive of VAT & CIC levy
TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE	Best Responsive and Competitive Tenderer



DETAILS OF ALL OTHER UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS			
NAME	NATIONALITY	EVALUATED BID PRICE	REASON FOR DISQUALIFICATION
Ntsika Yetfu	Swati	SZL 722,716.92	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Muzo Investment	Swati	SZL 1,427,015.60	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Channah	Swati	SZL 783,575.32	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Bluewave Civils	Swati	SZL 1,082,140.16	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
H-Devine	Swati	SZL 1,249,261.52	Higher bid price compared to that of
Contractors		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Malwakhe	Swati	SZL 703,765.40	Higher bid price compared to that of
Construction		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Innovator	Swati	SZL 1,009,581.16	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investments		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
My Turn	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
Dokas Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
Pincus	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
CNX	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Construction			
SR & GZ Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
of Companies			
Fakumfutfo	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Mabhe	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			n na



### SOUTHWEST REGION

DETAILS OF BEST EVALUATED RESPON	SIVE TENDERER FOR HLATIKHULU WTP		
NAME	Channah Investments		
NATIONALITY	SWATI		
PROPOSED CONTRACT PRICE	<b>SZL 1,015,100.48</b> (One Million, Fifteen Thousand, One hundred Emalangeni and Forty-Eight Cents) Inclusive of VAT & CIC levy		
TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE	Best Responsive and Competitive Tenderer		

DETAILS OF ALL OTHER UNSUCCESSFUL BIDDERS			
NAME	NATIONALITY	Evaluated BID PRICE	REASON FOR DISQUALIFICATION
Ntsika Yetfu	Swati	SZL 1,084,075.38	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investment		(VAT & CIC Levy Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Muzo Investment	Swati	SZL 2,140,523.40	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT & CIC Levy Inclusive)	most responsive tenderer
Palm Tree (Pty)	Swati	SZL 1,194,749.76	Higher bid price compared to that of
Ltd		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Bluewave Civils	Swati	SZL 1,623,210.24	Higher bid price compared to that of
		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
H-Devine	Swati	SZL 1,873,892.28	Higher bid price compared to that of
Contractors		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Malwakhe	Swati	SZL 1,055,648.10	Higher bid price compared to that of
Construction		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
Innovator	Swati	SZL 1,514,371.74	Higher bid price compared to that of
Investments		(VAT & CIC Levy	most responsive tenderer
		Inclusive)	
My Turn	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			



Dokas Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
Pincus	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			
CNX	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Construction			
SR & GZ Group	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
of Companies			
Fakumfutfo	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Mabhe	Swati	N/A	Was not technically responsive.
Investments			Exercise and the second s

It must be noted that, in terms of section 45(2) of the Act, the above contract award decision does not constitute a contract.

Further, in terms of section 45(4), 46, and 47 of the Act, all tenderers who submitted bids are hereby notified that a period of ten (10) working days is hereby allowed for submission of any application for review from the above stated date of first publication of this notice.

B. Njenh

# CHAIRPERSON OF THE TENDER BOARD

