



PART A

NOTICE FOR SELECTION OF PROCUREMENT AWARD

BID NAME: Request for Proposal for the selection of legal practitioners for a legal panel for the provision of legal services to the Namibia University of Science and Technology for three (3) years.

Procurement Reference No: CS/RFP/NUST-021/2025

Pursuant to Section 55 of the Public Procurement Act No.15 of 2015 and following a competitive Procurement exercise undertaken in accordance with the Act, the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) has resolved to appoint the following bidder:

Bidder Name	Physical Address
Susan Nyatondo Incorporated	No 15, Veronica Court, Nachtigal Street, Ausspannplatz, Windhoek
Andreas Hamunyela Legal Practitioners	No 13, Cnr John Meinert & Johan Albrecht Street, Whk West
Brockerhoff and Associates Incorporated	Erf 1133, Office Suite 3, First Floor, 8 Brandberg Street, Eros, Whk

PART B

NOTICE TO THE FOLLOWING BIDDERS NOT SELECTED FOR AWARD:

No.	Supplier Name
1	Kwala and Company Incorporated
3	Katjaerua Incorporated
4	Henry Shimutwikeni and Company Incorporated
5	Palyeenime Incorporated
6	Pack and Company Incorporated
7	Kauta, Barendse and Kishi Incorporated (CDH)
8	Dr Weder, Kruger and Haikali Incorporated
9	Kishi Shakumu and Company Incorporated
11	FB Law Chambers
12	Iileni Gebhardt and Company Incorporated
13	Jauch Nyashanu Naunyanggo Incorporated
15	Anne Shilengudwa Incorporated
16	Tjitemisa and Associates
17	Kangueehi and Kavendjii Incorporated
18	Elago and Partners

- a) Kindly note that the bidder whose particulars are specified in **PART A** has been selected for the award.
- b) The criteria used to select the bidder for the award in paragraph (a) are in the bidding document reference number **CS/RFP/NUST-021/2025**.
- c) Kindly note that if you are not satisfied with the selection for the award made by the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST), you may make an application for the review of the selection made within seven (7) days of this notice. In the absence of an application for review, the Accounting Officer will award the contract to the bidders selected for the award.
- d) The period of seven (7) days referred to in paragraph (d) starts on **16 February 2026** and ends on **24 February 2026 at 16h30 (Namibian Time)**.

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

BID NAME: Request for Proposals for the Provision for the selection of legal practitioners for a legal panel for the provision of legal services to the Namibia University of Science and Technology for three (3) years.

Date: 13 February 2026

Procurement Reference No: CS/RFP/NUST-021/2025

Scope of Contract:

Request for proposal for the selection of legal practitioners for a legal panel for the provision of legal services to the Namibia University of Science and Technology for three (3) years.

1. **Procurement Method:** Request for Proposals Section 35 (4) of the Public Procurement Act, 2015.
2. **Date of Invitation for Bids:** 24 October 2025
3. **Closing date of submission of bids:** 14 November 2025
4. **Date and Place of Opening of bids:** 14 November 2025, Office of the Registrar Boardroom
5. **Number of bids received by closing date:** Eighteen (18)
6. **RESPONSIVENESS OF BIDS:**

The summary of the responsiveness of the bids:

Bid No.	Bidder Name	Responsiveness as per the evaluation stage			
		Mandatory Documents	Technical Evaluation	Financial Evaluation	Reasons why the bid is/not responsive
1	Kwala AMD Incorporated	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	- The bidder provided an invalid Identity Document (copy of certified copy). The bidder was disqualified.
2	Susan Nyatondo Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Qualified	The bidder met all the requirements. The bidder qualified.
3	Katjaerua Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	- The bidder provided the professional fees and did not include additional or other associated services.

					<p>- The bidder included charges for overheads, e.g. the rate for the services provided by the firm's secretary.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
4	Henry Shimutwiken and Company Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	<p>- There is no distinction in the rates for the senior legal practitioner and candidate legal practitioners, as per the Law Society and High Court Tariffs.</p> <p>- Did not provide fees for other cost as per the bidding document.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
5	Palyeenime Incorporated	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	<p>Technically scored 67.5%.</p> <p>- No methodology and work plan submitted.</p> <p>- The bidder did not provide a list of legal practitioners who will be assigned to this contract, clearly indicating their years of experience, qualifications and areas of expertise.</p> <p>- The bidder did not meet the minimum 70% score required to proceed to financial evaluation stage.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
6	Pack and Company Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	<p>- The proposed rates fall below the applicable court prescribed tariffs.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
7	Kauta, Barendse and Kishi Incorporated (CDH)	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	<p>- The bidder did not provide a valid certified Identity Document of the following shareholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Patrick Kauta (colour copy) 2. Mr Rodges D Barendse (scanned copy). 3. Ms Bonita R De Silva (illegible scanned copy). 4. Ms Ilda M Dos Santos (copy of certified copy). <p>- The bidder did not provide a copy of the Affirmative Action Compliance Certificate or proof from the Employment Equity Commissioner that a bidder is not a relevant employer or an exemption issued in terms of section 42 of the Affirmative Action Act, 1998.</p>

					<p>- The bidder provided an invalid copy of the company's good standing Tax Certificate from NAMRA (a copy of a certified copy).</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
8	Dr Weder, Kruger and Haikali Incorporated	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	<p>-The bidder did not provide valid Identity Documents for the following shareholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Andre Swanepoel (copy of certified copy) 2. Mr Tshuka Luvindao (copy of certified copy) 3. Mr Abraham AJ Naude (copy of certified copy) 4. Mr Etienne H Yssel (copy of certified copy) 5. Ms Liana T Van de Berg (Illegible copy of certified copy) 6. Mr Cornelius PJ Potgieter (copy of certified copy) 7. Mr Ralph B Strauss (copy of certified copy) 8. Mr Paul HK Botha (copy of certified copy) 9. Mr Abraham J Malherbe (copy of certified copy) 10. Ms Beatrix Greyvenstein (copy of certified copy) 11. Ms Risa Dreyer (copy of certified copy) 12. Ms Nadine Van Schalkwyk (copy of certified copy) 13. Ms Liza Martins (copy of certified copy). <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
9	Kishi Shakumu and Company Incorporated	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	<p>- The bidder submitted an invalid valid copy of the company's good standing Tax Certificate from NAMRA (expired certificate 10.10.2025).</p> <p>- No proof of Company Registration provided.</p> <p>- The bidder provided invalid Identity Documents of the following shareholders:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Silas K Shakumu (copy of certified copy)

					2. Mr Holenge T Kasita (copy of certified copy). The bidder was disqualified.
10	Brockhoff and Associates Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Qualified	The bidder met all the requirements. The bidder qualified.
11	FB Law Chambers	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	The bidder did not provide a copy of the company's good standing Tax Certificate from NAMRA. The bidder was disqualified.
12	Ileni Gebhardt and Company Incorporated	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	- Technically scored 58%. - No methodology and work plan submitted. - Did not provide the Bachelor of Laws (LLB) or equivalent. - The bidder did not provide a list of legal practitioners who will be assigned to this contract, clearly indicating their years of experience, qualifications and areas of expertise. - The bidder provided two (2) valid reference letters instead of the three (3) as required in the bidding document. The requirement was for reference letters that set out: the entity's name, nature of the contract, duration of contract, contact person and office telephone number, and email address. The reference letters should be for contracts completed within the last five (5) years (2020 to 2025). - The bidder did not meet the minimum 70% score required to proceed to financial evaluation stage. The bidder was disqualified.
13	Jauch Nyashanu Naunyango Incorporated	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	- Technically scored 65%. - The bidder provided one (1) valid reference letters. The requirement was for reference letters that set out: the entity's name, nature of the contract, duration of contract, contact person and office telephone number, and email address. The reference letters should be for contracts completed within the last five (5) years (2020 to 2025)

					<p>- Has minimum of three (3) years of extensive experience and expertise in providing various legal services for state-owned enterprise, other public entities as well as the private sector.</p> <p>- The bidder did not meet the minimum 70% score required to proceed to financial evaluation stage.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
14	Andreas Hamunyela Legal Practitioners	Qualified	Qualified	Qualified	<p>The bidder met all the requirements.</p> <p>The bidder qualified.</p>
15	Anne Shilengudwa Incorporated	Qualified	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	<p>- They did not provide a fee structure pertaining to the legal practitioners and their years of experience, as required in Annexure 2, page 9 of the bidding document.</p>
16	Tjitemisa and Associates	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	<p>- The bidder certified its own documents. As per the court judgement of <i>Bank Windhoek Limited v Kock Investments</i> HC-MD-CIV-ACT-CON-2020/03329 [2020] NAHCMD 574 (7 December 2020); a Commissioner of Oaths cannot administer an oath or affirmation or certify documentation relating to a matter in which he has an interest or that he/she has produced. The bidder is thus not allowed to certify its own documents, hence, invalid.</p> <p>The bidder was disqualified.</p>
17	Kangueehi and Kavendjii Incorporated	Qualified	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	<p>- Technically scored 65%.</p> <p>- No methodology and work plan submitted.</p> <p>- The bidder provided two (2) valid reference letters instead of the three (3) as required in the bidding document. The requirement was for reference letters that set out: the entity's name, nature of the contract, duration of contract, contact person and office telephone number, and email address. The reference letters should be for contracts completed within the last five (5) years (2020 to 2025)</p>

					- The bidder did not meet the minimum 70% score required to proceed to financial evaluation stage. The bidder was disqualified.
18	Elago and Partners	Non responsive and disqualified	Not considered	Not considered	- The bidder did not provide the Partnership Agreement or Company Registration documents as stipulated in the bidding document. The bidder was disqualified.

7. Summary of evaluation of financial proposals:

Bid No.	Name of Bidder	Comments
2	Susan Nyatondo Incorporated	- The bidder clearly stipulated fees in accordance with the requirements in the bidding document. - Responsive evaluated bid.
3	Katjaerua Incorporated	- The bidder provided the professional fees and did not include additional or other associated services. - The bidder included charges for overheads, e.g. the rate for the services provided by the firm's secretary. - Non-Responsive bid.
4	Henry Shimutwikeni and Company Incorporated	- There is no distinction in the rates for the senior legal practitioner and candidate legal practitioners, as per the Law Society and High Court Tariffs. - Did not provide fees for other cost as per the bidding document. - Non-Responsive bid.
6	Pack and Company Incorporated	- The proposed rates fall below the applicable court prescribed tariffs. - Non-Responsive bid.
10	Brockerhoff and Associates Incorporated	- The bidder clearly stipulated fees in accordance with the requirements in the bidding document.

		- Responsive evaluated bid.
14	Andreas Hamunyela Legal Practitioners	- The bidder clearly stipulated fees in accordance with the requirements in the bidding document. - Responsive evaluated bid.
15	Anne Shilengudwa Incorporated	- They did not provide a fee structure pertaining to the legal practitioners and their years of experience, as required in Annexure 2, page 9 of the bidding document. - Non-Responsive bid.

8. Recommendation for Award:

The Namibia University of Science and Technology recommends the award for the selection of legal practitioners for a legal panel for the provision of legal services to the Namibia University of Science and Technology for three (3) years to the following bidders, as they met the requirements and their bids were responsive:

1. **Susan Nyatondo Incorporated**
2. **Andreas Hamunyela Legal Practitioners**
3. **Brockhoff and Associates Incorporated**

Sincerely



Prof Andrew Niikondo

Accounting Officer/Acting Vice-Chancellor

