

PUBLICATION OF CONTRACT AWARD

REHABILITATION AND COMPLETION OF KPONG LEFT BANK IRRIGATAION PROJECT
MOFA/GCAP/WK/ICB/2017/02

A. CONTRACTORS THAT SUBMITTED BIDS

S/N	Name of firm/JV	Country of Origin
1	Max-Kwei Company Limited (MKCL)	Ghana
2	OAS Ghana Limited/ Construtora	Ghana/Brazil
3	China Geo Eng Corp. (Ghana)	China
4	Amandi Holding	British Virgin Islands
5	Arda Grup	Turkey
6	China Gansu International Co For Eco Tec Cooperation	China
7	Sinohydro Corp. Limited	China
8	Rolider Ghana Limited	Ghana
9	Yangtse River International Engineering	China
10	Zhongmei Engineering Group Limited	China
11	Myturn Limited	Ghana
12	China Shanxi Sijian Group Limited	China
13	K.K. Royal Limited/Elevation	Ghana/Spain
14	Sinopec International Services Limited	China
15	Top International Engineering Corp.	China
16	OM Metals- SPML (JV)	India/ India

B. BID PRICES AS READ OUT AT BID OPENING

No.	Name of Bidder	Readout Price	
		US\$	GH¢
1	Max-Kwei Company Limited (MKCL)	73,163,017.15	-
2	OAS Ghana Limited/ Construtora	67,372,653.84	-
3	China Geo Eng Corp. (Ghana)	34,865,154.26	40,041,329.91
4	Amandi Holding	59,173,277.16	-
5	Arda Grup	42,712,423.67	-
6	China Gansu International Co For Eco Tec Cooperation	28,912,762.00	-
7	Sinohydro Corp. Limited	42,328,832.28	-
8	Rolider Ghana Limited	48,713,723.77	-
9	Yangtse River International Engineering	18,981,107.01	-
10	Zhongmei Engineering Group Limited	28,401,591.62	1,064,250.00
11	Myturn Limited	44,382,459.02	-
12	China Shanxi Sijian Group Limited	27,456,140.07	-
13	K.K. Royal Limited/Elevation	33,097,681.25	-
14	Sinopec International Services Limited	46,896,088.00	-
15	Top International Engineering Corp.	34,109,961.60	-
16	OM Metals- SPML (JV)	33,153,377.55	-

C. EVALUATED PRICES OF EACH BID THAT WAS EVALUATED

No.	Name of Bidder (firm/JV)	Evaluated Bid Price		Evaluated Bid Price (Single Currency)
		GH¢	US\$	US\$
1	China Geo Eng Corp. (Ghana)	36,795,563.02	31,359,736.28	39,766,115.62
2	Amandi Holding	-	53,889,561.46	53,889,561.46
3	Sinohydro Corp. Limited	-	38,137,250.10	38,137,250.10
4	Sinopec International Services Limited	-	42,296,443.54	42,296,443.54
5	OM Metals- SPML (JV)	-	28,675,859.63	28,675,859.63
Exchange Rate For Conversion To Single Currency		US\$ 1 = GH¢ 4.3771 (Source of Exchange Rate: Bank of Ghana foreign exchange rate -- 18/10/2017)		

D. THE NAMES OF BIDDERS WHOSE BIDS WERE EITHER REJECTED AS NONRESPONSIVE OR NOT MEETING QUALIFICATION CRITERIA, OR NOT EVALUATED, WITH THE REASONS THEREOF

No.	Name of Bidder (firm/JV)	Reasons for Rejection/Non Responsiveness/Disqualification
1	Max-Kwei Company Limited (MKCL)	<p>Bidder did not provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter authorising Client to seek references from the bidder’s bank and former employers, • Key Personnel Qualification/Experience, • 5-yr Audited Account, • Rate Build-up, • Site Organization, • Historical Contract Non-performance & Litigation, and • ESHS Performance Declaration. <p>Absence of these documents rendered the bid inconsistent with ITB Clauses 11.1, 16.1, 20.2, 37 and therefore substantially non-responsive and thus the bid was not considered for further evaluation</p>
2	China Gansu International Co For Eco Tec Cooperation	<p>Bidder submitted the following contrary to ITB Clauses 11.1 and 20.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An invalid Power of Attorney (no specimen signature of the authorized representative); • An invalid bid security (issued in the name of China State Hualong Construction Ghana Limited meanwhile no evidence was provided for an existing relationship between China State Hualong Construction Ghana Limited and China Gansu International Co. for Eco Tec Cooperation), as required by ITB Clauses 11.1 and 20.2. <p>Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Program was sub-standard and poorly presented as stated duration in the MS program did not match the bar lengths; • Technical proposal on automation and instrumentation was unsatisfactory – SCADA specification was inadequate and instrumentation work program was unrealistic and without details.

3	YANGTSE RIVER INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder submitted a bid form not in conformity with the approved format; • Did not submit a letter authorizing the client to seek references from the bidder's bank and former employers see Attachment 12; • No submission of Rate Build-up. <p>These were not in conformity with ITB Clause 11, 12.1, 20.2, and 37 and were considered substantially non-responsive and thus the bid was not considered for further evaluation</p>
4	Myturn Limited	<p>Bidder did not provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter authorizing the client to seek references from the bidder's former employers; • Code of Conduct (ESHS); • Information on Historical Contract Non-performance & Litigation; • ESHS Performance Declaration; and • Construction Experience in Key activities. <p>These were not in conformity with ITB Clauses 11, 16 and 37.</p> <p>Also their proposal was short of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate site management/organization; • Inadequate mobilization schedule; • Unrealistic construction schedule/work program (12 months without instrumentation and defects liability period); • Insufficient construction equipment (no evidence of leasehold or rent provided); • Absence of code of conduct; • Inadequate specific experience and non-submission of key activities forms; • Lack of proposals on instrumentation/automation
5	China Shanxi Sijian Group Limited	<p>Bidder did not provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter authorizing the client to seek references from the bidder's former employers; • Current Contract Commitments/Works in progress; • Construction Experience in Key activities. <p>These were not in conformity with ITB Clauses 11, 16 and 37 Method statement was weak and not comprehensive.</p> <p>Also;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work program did not cover the defects liability period; • No technical proposal was provided on automation see Attachment 14;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work program on automation was not detailed; • No provision of evidence of experience in automation.
6	K.K. Royal Limited/Evolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidder submitted a bid form not in conformity with the approved format; • Bid security could not be authenticated by the issuing Bank, <p>Absence of the these documents rendered the bid inconsistent with ITB Clauses 12.1(a), 12, 37 and therefore substantially non-responsive and thus the bid was not considered for further evaluation</p>
7	Top International Engineering Corp.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsatisfactory mobilization schedule; • Automation technical proposal was below average; • Inadequate personnel experience for automation and instrumentation
8	Zhongmei Engineering Group Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work program and staff mobilisation did not match; • No technical proposal on automation; • Automation work program lacked details; • Methodology was scanty and inadequate to demonstrate Bidder's ability to execute the works in accordance with the ITB.
9	Rolider Ghana Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work program for instrumentation and automation was unrealistic; • No indication of training of personnel on automation and no mention of operation and maintenance; • Instrumentation was silent on diesel generator and solar panels; • Work methodology was poorly presented and lacked details; • No presentation of specific experience
10	OAS Ghana Limited/ Construtora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The method statement was too generic; did not cover the major activities; • Project Manager and other key personnel are available for only 18 months leaving the defects liability period unattended; • Key staff have no similar/specific experience; • Works program was scanty on automation; • Equipment mobilization schedule was not written in English; • Labour mobilization chart did not cover key staff.

11	Arda Grup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Program was not detailed enough; • Method statement was poorly presented and was adjudged inadequate; • Not all CVs were provided for personnel and some were incomplete; • No technical proposal on automation was provided.
----	-----------	---

Name of Winning Bidder: OM Metals- SPML (JV)

Final Total Contract Price: US\$32,012,453.18

Duration of Contract: 18 Months

Summary Scope:

LOCATION	PART	WORKS ACTIVITY	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES				
North Tongu District, Ghana	A	Civil works	Gravity/Sprinkler irrigation schemes (2 nos.) of minimum	Steel Reinforcement	Land levelling of two (2) irrigation Projects of min.	Concrete works for canal lining and irrigation structures.	Earthworks related to Canals, drains and dam embankment formation.
			1,500 hectares each	15.0 tonnes per month	1,500 hectares.	10,000 Cu.M per month	150,000 Cu.M. Per month
	B	Instrumentation and Automation	Canal automation with SCADA Technology for two irrigation schemes. Experience of design of integrated canal management system involving minimum 10 automated & remotely controlled gates, using a wireless centralized computer directed control using SCADA software, for open channel canals.				