



Kampala

Kampala, 11th November 2018

TENDER EVALUATION REPORT FOR SECURITY SERVICES

1. Background

The Embassy of Sweden in Kampala's security arrangement with its current service provider is expiring.

The Embassy thought it was the right time to update and strengthen its security arrangements to be able to cope with the current country environment and context demands to be able to effectively conduct its missions.

The Embassy carried out a survey involving EU diplomatic missions to Uganda to inform itself on how the industry was currently operating when it came to security for diplomatic missions for example with regards to the remuneration of guards, working shifts and other practical security arrangements they had in place.

Based on the above-mentioned information, the Embassy decided to procure the services of a Security Company on a framework basis.

The framework agreement term period is to run for 24 calendar months. The Embassy of Sweden is entitled (though not obligated) to extend the framework agreement twice with 12 calendar months, with unaltered terms and conditions.

Under the performance-based contract the key objectives would be to prevent unauthorized access, protect life and assets, maintain order, and prevent criminal attacks against employees, dependants, property and terrorist acts.

2. The Selection Process (Prior to Technical Evaluation)

Publication

The procurement was published on the Embassy's webpage <https://www.swedenabroad.se/en/embassies/uganda-kampala/about-us/procurement/> and

11th November 2018

in the local daily newspapers. i.e. The Daily Monitor and The New Vision

The deadline for submission of tenders was 15th June 2018

Tenders received

Upon the opening of the tenders on 18th June 2018, it was noted that 8 tenderers had submitted their bid documents, see Appendix I.

3. Technical Evaluation

Minimum Qualification Requirements

The submitted bids were then subjected to an evaluation to validate whether they were complying with all the must/shall requirements that were mentioned in the tender documents.

Two bids were evaluated to be complying with all the must/shall requirements They were;

- Tender 3 - SGA
- Tender 6 - KK Security

Six bids were evaluated not to be complying with the must/shall requirements. They were;

- Tender 1 - Senaca Uganda
- Tender 2 - Securex Agencies Uganda Limited
- Tender 4 - Ultimate Security Limited
- Tender 5 - GKO Security Limited
- Tender 7 - Pinnacle Security Limited
- Tender 8 - G4S Uganda Limited

The common pitfall for the tenders evaluated to be non-compliant was the failure to meet the Embassy's request in the ToRs for the preferred minimum salary of any personnel under this framework agreement to be UGX 350,000.

The Evaluation committee based their decision on this matter from the information provided in Appendix D where the lowest salary that could

11th November 2018

possibly be provided should have been UGX 350,000 before any allowances or additions in order to guarantee that the guards would not at any point during the contract execution fall below the minimum prescribed wage. This would for example be the case in scenarios when they take leave and are unable to work/earn overtime.

The bids that did not meet all the must/shall requirements could not advance to the next round of evaluations.

A summary of the reasons for disqualification is provided in Appendix II.

Evaluation Guidelines

The two bids that complied with the must requirements specified in the Invitation to Tender were subjected to a technical evaluation according to the criteria that was stated in Section 5 of the Invitation to Tender.

Technical Evaluation Process

A Procurement Committee further carried out site visits for the two Companies that advanced to the Technical Evaluation stage to get a feel of the facilities and equipment they had in place to be able to execute the contract. The site visit included a brief presentation from the companies, a Q and A session, plus a guided tour around the company's premises and departments but with more time being spent in their respective Control rooms to better appreciate how effectively and efficiently they operated.

Prior to the site visits, one of the tenderers requested to visit the Embassy's premises to inform their presentation to the Embassy and for them to be able to answer any questions that may be posed by the Embassy.

Result of Technical Evaluation

After the site visits the technical evaluation was carried out. A summary of the scores from the technical evaluation is as shown below.

11th November 2018

Evaluation criteria	Methodology and Approaches	Facilities and resources available to firm	Experience of the firm	Quality assurance	Qualifications and competence	Total
Max point	20	20	10	10	10	70
Tender No 3	16	20	8	6	8	58
Tender No 6	12	16	10	8	8	54

4. Financial Evaluation

Financial Evaluation Process

The financial evaluation was carried as mentioned in Section 5 of the Invitation to Tender document.

As stated in the Tender documents, the tenders that received at least 50 points were to be eligible for further Financial evaluation.

Both Tender No 3 and No 6 could score above the minimum 50 points and were therefore eligible for the Financial evaluation.

Items Recommended to be clarified

1.Allowances.

When assessing the proposed fee quotations in Appendix E and the breakdown in Appendix D submitted by the two Tenders, it was noted that there were items which made them incomparable and gave an unfair advantage to one of the bidders.

This was about the allowances provided to the guards like medical insurance and meals. These were suggested to be provided by one of the tenderers but not in the competing tender. These were judged to be very important for Embassy's guards since one of the outcomes of the procurement was to have better working conditions for the guards to boost their motivation and morale.

This meant when comparing prices, the tender without the above-mentioned allowances was relatively cheaper but not necessary offering the best employment terms for the guards.

This was deemed to be unfair by the procurement committee and the tenderer without the allowances was requested asked to clarify on what

11th November 2018

the fee quotation with allowances integrated within the would be. The tenderer shared this information within the timeframe provided.

2. Roadside rescue services.

When assessing the roadside rescue, it was noted that despite both tenderers being able to provide the service, the modalities in which it was billed and charged to the Embassy were different. One of the Tenderers charged for the service as and when it was needed while the other one charged for it as a subscription.

For purposes of having comparable prices with a similar charging modality, both tenders were given an opportunity to clarify to the embassy what the cost of roadside rescue would be if charged as a monthly subscription fee per person to which they all responded in time provided.

When the above clarifications were received, the Evaluation Committee proceeded to carry out the price evaluation as illustrated below.

Financial Evaluation

12hour Shift

- Tender No 3 - 12hr Shift Price: 4 062 000 UGX
- Tender No 6 - 12hr Shift Price: 2 735 000 UGX

Linear evaluation – lowest price as base		
	Maxpoint for price:	Lowest call-off price (SEK):
	30	2 735 000
	Call-off price	Price point
Tender No 3	4 062 000	20,2
Tender No 6	2 735 000	30,0

11th November 2018

8hour shift

- Tender No 3 - 8hr Shift Price: 3 269 500 UGX
- Tender No 6 - 8hr Shift Price: 2 492 286 UGX

Linear evaluation – lowest price as base		
	Maxpoint for price:	Lowest call-off price (SEK):
	30	2 492 286
	Call-off price	Price point
Tender No 3	3 269 500	22,9
Tender No 6	2 492 286	30,0

5. Combined Technical & Financial Evaluation

<i>Consultant Names</i>	<i>Technical Scores</i>	<i>Financial Scores</i>	<i>Final Score</i>
Tender No 3 - 12hr shift	58	20.2	78.2
Tender No 6 - 12hr shift	54	30	84

<i>Consultant Names</i>	<i>Technical Scores</i>	<i>Financial Scores</i>	<i>Final Score</i>
Tender No 3 - 8hr shift	58	22.9	80.9
Tender No 6 - 8hr shift	54	30	84

6. Award Recommendation

The final evaluation of tenders shows that Tender No 6-KK Security submitted the most economically advantageous tender across both the 12hr and 8hr shifts to perform the requested services.

List of Annexes:

ANNEX 1 List of tenders received

ANNEX II Must/Shall criteria evaluation