

REVISED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE BID EVALUATION REPORT (SECTION 55(8))

1.	Name of Procurement	Procurement of Rendering of Security Services to the Municipality Council of Swakopmund for a Period of Twenty-Four (24) Months
2.	CPBN Procurement Reference No	NCS/OAB/CPBN-06/2022
3.	Date of Submission of Report	31 August 2023
4.	Contract Number	NCS/OAB/CPBN-06/2022
5.	Scope of Contract	Procurement of Rendering of Security Services to the Municipality Council of Swakopmund for a Period of Twenty-Four (24) Months
6.	Estimated Cost:	N\$16,308,054.00
7.	Funding Agency	Municipality of Swakopmund
8.	Procurement Method Used	Open Advertised Bidding (OAB)
9.	Date of Invitation of Bids	14 October 2022
10.	Closing Date of Submission of Bids	30 November 2022
11.	Date and Place of Opening of Bids	30 November 2022, at Central Procurement Board of Namibia
12.	Number of Bids Received by Closing Date	Thirty-Seven (37)

13. Responsiveness of Bid(s)

Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages							Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Stage 1			Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	
1	MGEE'S Investment CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	- The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the following supporting documents were not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document. ✓ Founding Statement/Company Registration Document ✓ Good Standing Tax Certificate ✓ Good Standing Social Security Certificate ✓ Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate ✓ SME Certificate ✓ Fitness Certificate
2	Maya Security Services CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	- The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the following documents were not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document; ✓ Letter to municipality ✓ Page 4 of company profile ✓ ID documentation (Petrus Gariseb)

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
3	Maletzky's Investment CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the Driver's license of J Geiseb is not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document.
5	Kahatijpara Investments CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	- The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the following documents were not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document; ✓ Tax invoice from Outdoor Centre ✓ Certificate of Code of Conduct on page 15
10	Ombala Security Services CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	- The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the following documents were not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document; ✓ Clarification no.1 ✓ Page 1 of Addendum no. 1 ✓ Certificate of Code of Conduct ✓ Two (2) copies of the ID

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
18	Kimpert Investments CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as page 78 was not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document;
19	Rubicon Security Services CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the Brochure is not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document;
20	Omeya Investments CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the copy of the vehicle registration document is not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document;
31	Altesia Trading & Investments CC	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as page 59 was not signed or initialed as required in ITB 19.2. and the Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement, Item No. 2.2 of the standard bidding document;

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
11	Wilco protection Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder submitted the same proof of ownership for the essential tools (same invoice, with the same number, IN238215) as that of Chief Nangolo Security Services CC. Thus, construing that the bidders have a relationship with each other. Therefore, the bidders were found to be conflicted in terms of ITB 6.1 (d) and contravened ITB 3.2 (ii) for fraudulent practices and (misrepresentation) by supplying false information.
24	Chief Nangolo Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder submitted the same proof of ownership for the essential tools (same invoice, with the same number, IN238215) as that of Wilco protection Services CC. Thus, construing that the bidders have a relationship with each other. Therefore, the bidders were found to be conflicted in terms of ITB 6.1 (d) and contravened ITB 3.2 (ii) for fraudulent practices and (misrepresentation) by supplying false information.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
28	Six Thousand Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder submitted the same proof of ownership for the essential tools (same invoice, with the same number, IN238584) as that of Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services CC. Thus, construing that the bidders have a relationship with each other. Therefore, the bidders were found to be conflicted in terms of ITB 6.1 (d) and contravened ITB 3.2 (ii) for fraudulent practices and (misrepresentation) by supplying false information.
34	Nahole Security and Debt Collection Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder submitted the same proof of ownership for the essential tools (same invoice, with the same number, IN238584) as that of Six thousand Security Services CC. Thus, construing that the bidders have a relationship with each other. Therefore, the bidders were found to be conflicted in terms of ITB 6.1 (d) and contravened ITB 3.2 (ii) for fraudulent practices and (misrepresentation) by supplying false information.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
6	Moto Trading and Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder did not comply with the requirement as they submitted an Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate that had expired, which was issued on the 8th October 2021 and was valid for 12 months and there was no confirmation letter submitted from the Employment Equity Commission indicating that the employer had submitted the report for the period following from the date when the certificate was issued contrary to ITB 13.1 (f) 4 and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.4 of the standard bidding document.
14	Sirka Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the submitted Good Standing Tax Certificate is not valid, it had expired on the 25th of November 2022 and the bid closed on the 30th November 2022. The bidder submitted the bid on the 30th November 2022 as per the submission register contrary to ITB 13.1 (f) 2 and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.2 of the standard bidding document.
16	Coastland Safety and Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the submitted copy of company registration (founding statement) was not certified as required in ITB 13.1(f) and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.1 of the standard bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2		
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
								• The bidder failed to comply with the requirement as the Good Standing Social Security Certificate was not submitted as required in ITB 13.1 (f) 3 and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.3 of the standard bidding document. • The bidder did not submit an Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate, or proof from Employment Equity Commissioner that bidder is not a relevant employer, or exemption issued in terms of Section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998 as required in ITB 13.1(f) 4 and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.4 of the standard bidding document. • The bidder did not submit a Certificate of Registration as a Bona-fide Security Service Provider with NAMPOL as required in ITB 5.3 (iv) and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.7 of the standard bidding document. • The bidder submitted a lease agreement however, the Fitness Certificate provided is for Katutura (Khomas Region) and not Erongo Region as required in ITB 5.3 (ii) and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.6 of the standard bidding document.
17	Degrade Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
23	Onyeka Protection services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder did not submit a Fitness Certificates from Municipalities or Town Councils and Title Deed or Lease Agreement from Erongo Region to confirm the location that the bidder is operating in the Region as required in ITB 5.3 (ii) and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.6 of the standard bidding document.
26	Otja One Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder did not submit an Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate, or proof from Employment Equity Commissioner that bidder is not a relevant employer, or exemption issued in terms of Section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998, (valid at the deadline of submission of bid) or in the event that the Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate is over 12 months from the date of issue, a confirmation letter from the Employment Equity Commission indicating that the employer had submitted the report for the period following from the date when the certificate was issued (certified by a Commissioner of Oath appointed in terms of the Justices of the Peace and Commissioners of Oaths Act:1963 (Act No. 16 of 1963)) as required in ITB 13.1(f) 4 and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.4 of the standard bidding document.

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
32	Bullet-G Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	Not Considered	The bidder did not submit a Certificate of Registration as a Bona-fide Security Service Provider with NAMPOL as required in ITB 5.3 (iv) and the Mandatory Requirement, Item No. 4.7 of the standard bidding document
7	M. Angukku Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	The bidder failed to meet the minimum technical score of 70% and only scored 58% at Technical Evaluation contrary to the standard bidding document requirement on page 34-39.
13	Namibia Peoples Protection Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	The bidder failed to meet the minimum technical score of 70% and only scored 45% at Technical Evaluation, contrary to the standard bidding document requirement on page 34-39.
29	West Valley Armed Response CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	The bidder failed to meet the minimum technical score of 70% and only scored 44% at Technical Evaluation, contrary to the standard bidding document requirement on page 34-39.
30	NAS Engineering and Construction CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Not Responsive & Disqualified	Not Considered	The bidder failed to meet the minimum technical score of 70% and only scored 64% at Technical Evaluation, contrary to the standard bidding document requirement on page 34-39.
4	Extra Defense Protection Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
8	PIS Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
9	Nelito Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified

Bidder No.	Name of the Bidder(s)	Responsiveness as per Evaluation Stages						Reasons why bid is NOT responsive
		Stage 1				Stage 2	Stage 3	
		Eligibility Evaluation	Preliminary/ Administrative Requirement	Conflict of Interest	Mandatory Requirements	Technical Evaluation: Security Services	Financial Requirements	
12	Bertha Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
15	Omatungo Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
21	Triple One Investments CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
22	Ombambudu Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
25	African King Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
27	Romeo Mike Investment CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
33	Namibia Protection Services (Pty) Ltd	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
35	Ndemutyavela Shomongula Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
36	Shikuvule Trading CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified
37	Omle Security Services CC	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Responsive	Bidder not Disqualified

14. Price Comparison for the Responsive Bid(s):

The BEC examined thirteen (13) bidders that were substantially responsive for arithmetic errors in terms of ITB 28 of the bidding document and Section 52 (5) of the PPA as amended. The BEC ranked the bidders according to price quoted from lowest to highest, and the contract will be awarded to the lowest evaluated substantially responsive bid in terms of Section 55 (1) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 (Act No. 15 of 2015).

Bidder No	Bidders Name	Lot (s)	Bid Price Read Out	Discount Offered	Corrected Bid Price	Error/ Difference	Ranking	Recommended/ Alternate
37	Omle Security Services CC	Lot 1: Zone 1	3,702,888.00	-	3,332,599.20	(370,288.80)	1	Recommended
21	Triple One Investments CC		3,460,716.00	-	3,460,716.00	-	2	1st Alternate
8	PIS Security Services		3,539,520.00	-	3,593,520.00	(54,000.00)	3	2nd Alternate
22	Ombambudu Security Services		3,995,056.80	-	3,995,056.80	-	4	
36	Shikwile Trading CC		4,038,804.00	-	4,038,804.00	-	5	
9	Nelito Investments CC		4,062,240.00	-	4,062,240.00	-	6	
15	Omatungo Security Services CC		3,931,200.00	-	4,062,240.00	(131,040.00)	7	
25	African King Security services CC		4,374,720.00	-	4,374,720.00	-	8	
4	Extra defence protection services CC		4,671,576.00	-	4,671,576.00	-	9	
33	Namibia Protection Services		4,801,255.20	-	4,801,255.20	-	10	
35	Ndemutyavela Shomongula Security Services CC		5,905,872.00	-	5,059,200.00	846,672.00	11	
12	Bertha Security Services CC		6,201,165.60	-	6,201,165.60	-	12	
27	Romeo Mike Investments CC		6,693,321.60	-	6,693,321.60	-	13	
21	Triple One Investments CC	Lot 2: Zone 2	3,437,726.40	-	3,437,838.00	111.60	1	Recommended
8	PIS Security Services		3,490,848.00	-	3,490,848.00	-	2	1st Alternate
37	Omle Security Services CC		3,536,380.80	-	3,536,380.80	-	3	2nd Alternate
9	Nelito Investments CC		3,794,400.00	-	3,794,400.00	-	4	
22	Ombambudu Security Services		3,880,912.32	-	3,880,912.32	-	5	
15	Omatungo Security Services CC		3,818,880.00	-	3,946,176.00	(127,296.00)	6	
36	Shikwile Trading CC		3,984,120.00	-	3,979,666.00	(4,454.00)	7	
25	African King Security services CC		4,249,728.00	-	4,249,728.00	-	8	
4	Extra defence protection services CC		4,538,102.40	-	4,538,102.40	-	9	
33	Namibia Protection Services		4,664,076.48	-	4,664,076.48	-	10	
35	Ndemutyavela Shomongula Security Services CC		5,786,344.00	-	5,463,936.00	322,408.00	11	
12	Bertha Security Services CC		6,720,641.28	-	6,720,641.28	-	12	
27	Romeo Mike Investments CC		7,224,537.60	-	7,224,537.60	-	13	

Bidder No	Bidders Name	Lot (s)	Bid Price Read Out	Discount Offered	Corrected Bid Price	Error/ Difference	Ranking	Recommended/ Alternate
9	Nelito Investments CC	Lot 3: Zone 3	3,142,656.00	-	3,142,656.00	-	1	Recommended
8	PIS Security Services		3,285,504.00	-	3,285,504.00	-	2	1st Alternate
37	Omle Security Services CC		3,356,928.00	-	3,356,928.00	-	3	2nd Alternate
21	Triple One Investments CC		3,628,339.20	-	3,642,624.00	14,284.80	4	
22	Ombambudu Security Services		3,652,623.36	-	3,652,623.36	-	5	
15	Omatungo Security Services CC		3,594,240.00	-	3,714,048.00	119,808.00	6	
36	Shikwile Trading CC		3,871,180.80	-	3,871,180.80	-	7	
25	African King Security services CC		3,999,744.00	-	3,999,744.00	-	8	
4	Extra defence protection services CC		4,270,795.20	-	4,271,155.20	360.00	9	
33	Namibia Protection Services		4,389,719.04	-	4,389,719.04	-	10	
35	Ndemutyavela Shomongula Security Services CC		4,945,536.00	-	5,142,528.00	196,992.00	11	
12	Bertha Security Services CC		6,371,020.80	-	6,371,020.80	-	12	
27	Romeo Mike Investments CC		6,799,564.80	-	6,799,713.60	148.80	13	
8	PIS Security Services CC	Lot 4: Zone 4	3,490,848.00	-	3,490,848.00	-	1	Recommended
37	Omle Security Services CC		3,551,558.40	-	3,551,558.40	-	2	1st Alternate
9	Nelito Investments CC		3,581,913.60	-	3,581,913.60	-	3	2nd Alternate
22	Ombambudu Security Services		3,880,912.32	-	3,880,912.32	-	4	
15	Omatungo Security Services CC		3,818,880.00	-	3,946,176.00	127,296.00	5	
21	Triple One Investments CC		3,961,353.60	-	3,961,353.60	-	6	
36	Shikwile Trading CC		3,977,424.00	-	4,097,952.00	120,528.00	7	
25	African King Security services CC		4,249,728.00	-	4,249,728.00	-	8	
4	Extra defence protection services CC		4,538,102.40	-	4,538,102.40	-	9	
33	Namibia Protection Services		4,664,076.48	-	4,664,076.48	-	10	
35	Ndemutyavela Shomongula Security Services		6,374,592.00	-	5,463,936.00	(910,656.00)	11	
12	Bertha Security Services CC		7,012,051.20	-	7,012,051.20	-	12	
27	Romeo Mike Investments CC		7,224,537.60	-	7,224,537.60	-	13	

15. Best Evaluated Bid(s)

Selected for Award of Contract:

Lowest Evaluated Substantially Responsive Bidder.

Given the recommendation(s) in the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) Report, the Board approved in terms of Section 9 (1) (k) and (l) (i) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015 as amended.

Bidder No	Bidder's Name	Lot(s) Allocated per Bidder	Bid Price Read Out at Bid Opening (Including VAT) N\$	Discount Offered	Corrections of Errors	Proposed Award Amount (Including VAT) N\$	Address
37	Omle Security Services CC	Lot 1: Zone 1	3,702,888.00	None	(370,288.80)	3,332,599.20	Erf 1024 Kleine Kuppe Windhoek or PO Box 22254 Windhoek
		Bid Price, Including VAT: Three Million, Three Hundred and Thirty Two Thousand, Five Hundred and Ninety Nine Namibia Dollars Twenty Cents					
21	Triple One Investments CC	Lot 2: Zone 2	3,437,726.40	None	111.60	3,437,838.00	Erf 3967 Einstein Street Swakopmund or PO Box 15325 Oshakati
		Bid Price, Including VAT: Three Million, Four Hundred and Thirty Seven Thousand, Eight Hundred and Thirty Eight Namibia Dollars					
9	Nelito Investments CC	Lot 3: Zone 3	3,142,656.00	None	-	3,142,656.00	Erf 37 Sunbird Street Naraville, Walvis Bay or PO Box 3314 Walvis Bay
		Bid Price, Including VAT: Three Million, One Hundred and Forty Two Thousand, Six Hundred and Fifty Six Namibia Dollars					
8	PIS Security Services CC	Lot 4: Zone 4	3,490,848.00	None	-	3,490,848.00	Erf 10456 Hans Dietrich Genscher Street, Windhoek or PO Box 63090 Wanaheda
		Bid Price, Including VAT: Three Million, Four Hundred and Ninety Thousand, Eight Hundred and Forty Eight Namibia Dollars					

This Executive Summary follows Reconsideration Application and Review Panel order dated 26 June 2023.

15 September 2023



A. Ngavetene
Chairperson



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM

**PROCUREMENT OF RENDERING OF SECURITY SERVICES TO THE MUNICIPALITY
COUNCIL OF SWAKOPMUND FOR A PERIOD OF TWENTY-FOUR (24) MONTHS
(PROCUREMENT REFERENCE NO. NCS/OAB/CPBN-06/2022)**

I/We _____ hereby
acknowledge receipt of this Executive Summary dated _____ and undertake to
immediately return the signed acknowledgment of receipt to CPBN as proof of receipt.

Name: Signature:

Date: Company Stamp: