PUBLIC PROCUREMENT AND DISPOSAL
OF PUBLIC ASSETS AUTHORITY
"Regulating for Results"

INSPECTION REPORT ON THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE CAR PARK SYSTEM AT ENTEBBE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT UNDER FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR TWO YEARS

ENTITY: UGANDA CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY

JUNE 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

BoQ	-	Bill of Quantities
CC	-	Contracts Committee
CG	-	Central Government
LTD	-	Limited
MoFPED	-	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MoU	-	Memorandum of Understanding
PPDA	-	Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority
S&B	-	Scheidt and Baachman
UCAA	-	Uganda Civil Aviation Authority
UGX	-	Uganda Shillings
USD	-	United States Dollars

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Authority received a request from the Inspectorate of Government Ref No: HQT/102/08/2025 dated 9th March 2026 to investigate irregularities in the procurement for maintenance and support of the Car Park System at Entebbe International Airport under framework contract for two years by Uganda Civil Aviation Authority under procurement reference No. UCAA/NCONS/24-25/100365.

It was specifically alleged that:

1. The Evaluation Committee irregularly disqualified Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd for failure to submit audited accounts by a registered firm, as required by the Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Uganda for the year ended 2022, contrary to the information provided in the bid document submitted to the Entity;
2. Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Manager Finance shared the bidding documents with Samanga Utilities Limited before the procurement was advertised by the Entity;
3. Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Manager Finance and Chairperson Evaluation Committee permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to submit their Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF) during the evaluation, and yet the bidder had not submitted this document with its bid on the bid closure date;
4. Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Manager Finance and Chairperson Evaluation Committee supported Samanga Utilites Limited in the preparation of the company's bid by linking the bidder with the carpark system manufacturer;
5. The Evaluation Committee irregularly allowed Samanga Utilities Limited to use a partnership document with a supplier/ distributor who was not authorized by the manufacturer to operate in Uganda and would therefore be unable to implement the project and perform their contractual obligation;
6. Samanga Utilities Limited was irregularly declared as the Best Evaluated Bidder even when they did not meet the evaluation criteria set in the bidding document, including the required technical knowledge and experience. That the bidder also formed a partnership with a supplier/ distributor not authorized by the manufacturer to operate in Uganda;
7. Samanga Utilities Limited irregularly increased the cost of maintenance and support for the car park system from a monthly rate of UGX 31,600,000 to UGX 50,000,000, resulting into an overcharge of UGX 441,600,000;
8. Evaluation Committee permitted a Joint Venture partnership with another company to validate Samanga Utilities Limited's qualification to provide maintenance and support services. That this decision contravened procurement requirements which would have automatically disqualified Samanga Utilities Limited under the PPDA Act and Regulations; and
9. The Procurement and Disposal Unit irregularly invited Samanga Utilities Limited for contract signing before resolution of the complaint pertaining to the procurement process which had been submitted to the Procurement and Disposal Unit by Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd.

2.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE INSPECTION

The inspection was conducted with the view of establishing the following:

1. Whether Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd was irregularly disqualified at bid evaluation for failing to provide audited accounts for the year 2022;

2. Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge shared the bidding document with Samanga Utilities Limited before the document was published on the Electronic Government Procurement (EGP) platform;
3. Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge gave Samanga Utilities Limited undue advantage in the procurement process by sending the company's representative to meet with the System Manufacturer in Germany;
4. Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge irregularly permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter of Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization Form during the evaluation process despite not submitting the same during bid opening;
5. Whether the Evaluation Committee and the Procurement and Disposal Unit erroneously allowed Samanga Utilities Limited to use a partnership document with a supplier/ a distributor who was not authorized by the manufacturer to operate in Uganda;
6. Whether Samanga Utilities Limited met the experience requirements set out in the bidding document;
7. Whether Samanga Utilities Limited irregularly increased the cost of maintenance and support for the car park system at Entebbe International Airport from UGX 31,600,000 to UGX 50,000,000 per month;
8. Whether the Evaluation Committee irregularly permitted a Joint Venture partnership with Samanga Utilities Limited to validate the company's qualification to provide maintenance and support services; and
9. Whether the Procurement and Disposal Unit irregularly invited the bidder for contract signing before concluding a dispute over the procurement process.

3.0 LAWS APPLICABLE

i) The PPDA Act, Cap 205;
ii) The PPDA Regulations 2023; and
iii) The PPDA Guidelines 2023

4.0 SCOPE

The inspection focused on the procurement process for the maintenance and support of the Car Park System at Entebbe International Airport under a framework contract two years.

5.0 METHODOLOGY

a) Documents retrieval and analysis: The following documents were retrieved and analyzed:
  i) The procurement action file;
  ii) The bids submitted for the procurement;
  iii) The contract management documents; and
  iv) Relevant correspondences between the Entity and various stakeholders

b) Interviews; The following officials were interviewed:

Table 1: People Interviewed

S/N	Name of interviewee	Title	Dates
1.	Ms. Nancy Owino Amuge	Finance Manager, Uganda Civil Aviation Authority	7th April 2026
2.	Mr. Augustine Amolu	Assistant Procurement Officer, Uganda Civil Aviation Authority	2nd April 2026

S/N	Name of interviewee	Title	Dates
3.	Mr. Katumba Ismail	Project Manager, Samanga Utilities Limited	14th April 2026

6.0 SUMMARY OF FACTS

6.1 On 13th December 2024, a member of the User Department raised a procurement requisition (Form 5) for the maintenance and support for the Car Park System at Entebbe International Airport at UGX 380,318,389, and the same was approved by the Accounting Officer on 1st January 2025.

6.2 On 10th January 2025, Ms. Nancy Amuge Owino, Manager Finance prepared Terms of Reference for the framework contract for comprehensive support and maintenance of the car parking management system at Entebbe International Airport. The Terms of Reference were approved by the Director Finance on 13th January 2025 and the same was submitted to the Procurement and Disposal Unit on 4th February 2025.

6.3 On 14th January 2025, a Market Survey team produced a report estimating the contract sum to be UGX 650,000,000 after analyzing the contracts for previous service providers namely, Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd and Paytech Limited who were contracted at UGX 524,587,550 and UGX 625,305,600 respectively.

6.4 On 13th February 2025, the Contracts Committee approved the use of Open Domestic Bidding Method and the Evaluation Committee comprising Ms. Juliet Kiwanuka, Mr. Moses Oketta, Ms. Phiona Mutesi, Mr. Augustine Amolu, Mr. Kwesigabo Andrew, Ms. Amuge Nancy Owino and Ms. Hannah Tumuhimbise. The persons involved in the preparation of the bidding document included Mr. James Mubiru, Ms. Amuge Nancy Owino, Mr. Augustine Amolu and Mr. Kwesigabo Andrew.

6.5 On 13th February 2025, a bid notice was published on the EGP system. The Entity subsequently issued the bidding document to three bidders namely; Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd, JK Techno Consults and Solutions Limited and Samanga Utilities Limited.

6.6 On 27th February 2025, a pre bid meeting was held at the Entity's Head Office, which meeting was attended by four bidders namely Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd, JK Techno Consults and Solutions Limited, Samanga Utilities Limited and Wilkens Telecommunications Ltd. This was attended by Ms. Nancy Owino Amuge, Dr. James Mubiru, Ms. Dinavence Tuhairwe, Ms. Doreen Atukwatse and Ms. Patra Ampeire on behalf of the Entity.

6.7 By the bid closure deadline 10th March 2025 at 11:00am, two bidders namely Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd and Samanga Utilities Limited had submitted their bids on 4th March 2025 and 5th March 2025 respectively.

6.8 On 10th March 2025, the Entity opened the bids submitted by the two bidders. Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd quoted UGX 379,134,734.55 while Samanga Utilities Limited quoted UGX 2,520,736,967.22. Samanga Utilities Limited's bid price was inclusive of monthly maintenance fee of UGX 50,000,000, training fees of UGX 89,790,000 and spare parts prices.

6.9 On 28th March 2025, the Evaluation Committee commenced bid evaluation with the signing of the Ethical Code of Conduct.

6.10 On 29th May 2025 and 10th June 2025, Ms. Nancy Owino Amuge, Chairperson Evaluation Committee sent Requests for Clarification to Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd and Samanga Utilities Limited respectively. Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd was requested to submit the company's audited books for the year 2022 while Samanga Utilities Limited was requested to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter from Scheidt and Bachman in Germany or an Authorized representative, or evidence of a partnership with an authorized partner. This was during the preliminary stage of bid evaluation.

6.11 On 2nd July 2025, the Evaluation Committee signed an evaluation report recommending award of contract for the maintenance and support of the car park system to Samanga Utilities Limited at UGX 380,318,389, translating to UGX 50,000,000 per month. Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd was disqualified at preliminary evaluation for failing to provide audited books for 2022.

6.12 On 16th July 2025, the Contracts Committee awarded the contract for the maintenance and support of the car park system at Entebbe International Airport under framework contract for a period of two years to Samanga Utilities Limited at UGX 50,000,000 per month, subject to negotiation on training costs. A negotiation team comprising of Mr. Moses Oketta, Ms. Nancy Amuge, Mr. Augustine Amolu, Ms. Phiona Mutesi and Ms. Tumuhimbise H. Hannah were approved by the Contracts Committee.

6.13 On 17th July 2025, the Negotiation Team met with the service provider where the training cost was reduced by 86% from UGX 89,790,000 to UGX 12,300,000 since the Entity would facilitate its staff by catering for return tickets, per diem and accommodation costs for training of the Entity's staff cost amounting to UGX 77,490,000). Only UGX 12,300,000 remained to cater for training instructor fees and training materials.

6.14 On 18th July 2025, the Contracts Committee considered the negotiation report and awarded the contract to Samanga Utilities Limited at UGX 50,000,000 per month, and a training cost of UGX 12,300,000. The Contacts Committee also approved the unit rates for spares.

6.15 On 18th July 2025, the Entity published the Best Evaluated Bidder Notice indicating the award of contract for the maintenance and support of the car park system to Samanga Utilities Limited at

UGX 50,000,000 and the unit rates for spares. The date for removal of the Notice was indicated as 1st August 2025.

6.16 On 22nd July 2025, the Entity sent the Best Evaluated Bidder Notice to Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd and Samanga Utilities Limited via email.

6.17 On 24th July 2025, Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd requested for administrative review of the evaluation results. The company's grievance was that they were disqualified for not submitting audited books of accounts by a registered auditing firm by the Institute of Certified Public Accountants (ICPAU) for the year 2022, contrary to the information submitted on pages 181-199 of the company's bid. The request was received by the Entity on 28th July 2025.

6.18 On 29th July 2025, the Accounting Officer acknowledged receipt of the request and advised the complainant to make a payment of UGX 5,000,000 for administrative review. The letter was received by Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd on 1st August 2025.

6.19 On 5th August 2025, Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd made a payment of UGX 5,000,000 administrative review fees to the Entity and submitted a letter of intent to pursue administrative review on the same day.

6.20 On 12th August 2025, the Accounting Officer informed the Director, Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd that the Entity did not find merit in their application for administrative review. That whereas the requirement in the bidding document was for bidders to provide two consecutive sets of audited accounts by a registered auditing firm by ICPAU for 2023 and 2022, the bidder only provided financial statements for the year ended 2023 and the year ended 2024, thereby missing audited accounts for 2022. That when the Evaluation Committee requested the bidder for the document, Live Systems Technologies Africa Ltd did not provide any response.

6.21 On 4th September 2025, the Manager Procurement requested the Company Secretary to prepare a contract for the maintenance and support of the Car Park System at Entebbe International Airport under framework contract for two years at UGX 50,000,000 per month, a training cos of UGX 12,300,000 and unit rates for spares and consumables. The service provider was indicated as Samanga Utilities Limited.

6.22 On 26th September 2025, the Accounting Officer approved a request for additional funds of UGX 300,000,000 which was raised by the User Department. On 31st October 2025, the Solicitor General cleared the contract for signature.

6.23 On 3rd December 2025, Uganda Civil Aviation Authority signed a contract with Samanga Utilities Limited for the provision of the maintenance and support of the Car Park System at Entebbe

International Airport under framework contract for two years at UGX 50,000,000 per month, a training cost of UGX 12,300,000 and unit rates for spares and consumables.

6.24 On 10th December 2025, the Accounting Officer appointed Mrs. Nancy O. Amuge as the Contract Manager.

7.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Whether Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd was irregularly disqualified at bid evaluation for failing to provide audited accounts for the year 2022

7.1.1 The complainant alleged that whereas Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd provided maintenance and support of the car park system at Entebbe International Airport from December 2022 to December 2024 and were the authorized representative of the system manufacturer (S&B) in Africa, the company was disqualified by the Entity for failing to submit audited accounts by a registered firm, as required by the Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Uganda for the year ended 2022, contrary to the information provided in the bid/ tender submission documents.

7.1.2 Regulation 5 of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023 states that: "The evaluation of bids shall be conducted in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the bidding documents."

7.1.3 Furthermore, Regulation 6(7) of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023 states that "*Where a bidder does not respond to a request for clarification or respond within the time specified under sub-regulation (1), the Evaluation Committee shall disqualify the bidder.*"

7.1.4 Sub-section 3.2(j) of Part B: Preliminary Examination Criteria in Section 3: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria (page 32) of the bidding document required the bidder to provide "two consecutive sets of audited accounts a registered auditing firm by the Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Uganda for 2023 and 2022. Foreign Firms whose accounts are audited by auditors in their principle place, must attach evidence that the auditors are registered in their principle place of business."

Entity's response

7.1.5 Ms. Nancy O Amuge, the Chairperson, Evaluation Committee stated that Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd was correctly disqualified for not providing audited financial statements for the year ending 2022, as required by the Entity in section 3 (j) of the Evaluation Methodology and Criteria.

7.1.6 That whereas the financial statements for 2023 had comparative figures for 2022, these did not provide assurance that the financial year ended 2022 had been independently audited and certified by a registered firm. That this was the reason why the Evaluation Committee requested the bidder to provide the audited financial statements for 2022, but Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd did not respond to the Committee's request. That the Committee was left with no option but to disqualify the bidder.

PPDA Findings

7.1.7 The Authority noted that Sub-section 3.2(j) in Section 3: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria of the bidding document required bidders to submit audited financial statements for the financial years 2022 and 2023 as part of the evaluation criteria. However, Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd did not include audited financial statements for the year 2022 in its bid. Instead, the bidder submitted audited financial statements for 2023 and 2024, which did not meet the stated requirement.

7.1.8 Although the audited financial statements for 2023 contained comparative figures for 2022, these figures could not be relied upon as audited financial statements for 2022, since there was no indication that the comparative figures were independently audited.

7.1.9 Subsequently, the Evaluation Committee sought clarification from Live System Technologies Africa (U) Ltd and requested submission of the audited financial statements for 2022. However, the bidder did not furnish the requested documents. Consequently, the bidder failed to meet the mandatory evaluation requirement for submission of audited financial statements for the years 2022 and 2023.

Conclusion

7.1.10 Arising from the above findings, the Evaluation Committee correctly disqualified the bidder. The Authority finds no merit in this allegation.

Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge shared the bidding document with Samanga Utilities Limited before the document was published on the Electronic Government Procurement (EGP) platform

7.1.11 The Complainant alleged that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Manager Finance had a pre-tender arrangement with Samanga Utilities Limited. That this arrangement began with the preparation of the tender scope for the procurement. That Ms. Amuge shared the bidding document with Samanga Utilities Limited before the same was published on the EGP portal.

7.1.12 Section 50(1)(a)(i) of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205 provides that *"a Procuring and Disposing Entity shall not disclose to a bidder or to any other person who is not involved in the preparation of the solicitation documents, the evaluation process or the award decision, any information relating to solicitation documents, before the solicitation documents are officially issued."*

Entity's Response

7.1.13 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Manager Finance refuted the allegation that she shared the bidding document with Samanga Utilities Limited. She stated that as Head, User Department, she, the Director Finance and IT technical team were involved in the preparation of specifications and the Terms of Reference for the procurement under review. That the bidding document was prepared by the Procurement and Disposal Unit.

7.1.14 Ms. Amuge further stated that the preparation of the Terms of Reference and the bidding document were handled in strict confidentiality within the confines of the Entity and was never shared with any bidder as alleged.

Bidder's response

7.1.15 When interviewed, Mr. Katumba Ismail, Project Manager, Samanga Utilities Limited stated that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge did not avail the bidding documents to the company as alleged.

PPDA Findings

7.1.16 Whereas Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Finance Manager participated in the preparation of the Terms of Reference and the bidding document, the Authority did not find any evidence that she shared the bidding document with Samanga Utilities Limited as alleged.

7.1.17 Furthermore, it was not irregular for Ms. Amuge to participate in the preparation of the Terms of Reference as the User Department since this was done in accordance with section 36 (1)(c)(d) of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205.

Conclusion

7.1.18 The Authority finds no merit in this allegation.

Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge gave Samanga Utilities Limited undue advantage in the procurement process by sending the company's representative to meet with the System Manufacturer in Germany

7.1.19 The complainant alleged that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge guided Samanga Utitlites Limited on the requirements of the tender by sending their representative to meet with the System Manufactrer in Germany, with the intention of giving Samanga Utilities Limited undue advantage in submitting the tender.

7.1.20 Section 48 of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205 states that *"all procurement and disposal shall be conducted in a manner which promotes transparency, accountability and fairness."*

Entity's response

7.1.21 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge stated that she neither arranged any meeting nor sent the representatives of Samanga Limited to meet with the system manufacturer in Germany. She stated that she does not have the capacity to arrange such a meeting.

Bidder's response

7.1.22 Mr. Katuma Ismail, Project Manager, Samanga Utilities Limited refuted the allegation that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge arranged a meeting between the company and the systems manufacturer. That the company met the systems manufacturer – Scheidt and Bachman in 2024 during a technology conference in Turkey, but this was before the bid notice was published in February 2025. That there was no meeting with the system manufacturer during the bidding process.

PPDA Finding

7.1.23 The Authority did not find any evidence to support the allegation that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge arranged a meeting between Samanga Utilities Limited and Scheidt and Bachman (systems manufacturer. Both Ms. Nancy and Samanga Utilities Limited denied that there was any such arrangement.

Conclusion

7.1.24 The Authority finds no merit in this allegation.

Whether Ms. Nancy O. Amuge irregularly permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter of Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization Form during the evaluation process despite not submitting the same during bid opening

7.1.25 The complainant alleged that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge irregularly permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to submit the Manufacturer's Authorization Letter of Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization Form during the evaluation process, despite the bidder not submitting the same at bid closing.

7.1.26 Regulation 6(1)(2) of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations 2023 states that *"An Evaluation Committee may at any stage of the evaluation, request a bidder to clarify the information provided in the bid or to submit additional information or documents within a period, which shall be indicated in the request, which shall be information or documents that were valid at the date of the deadline for bid submission."*

"An Evaluation Committee shall only make a request for clarification of information or submission of documents under sub-regulation (1) where there is a nonconformity or an omission in the bid, which is not a material deviation."

7.1.27 ITB 5.5 in Section 2: Bid Data Sheet in the bidding document states that *"the bidder shall be required to include with its bid, documentation from the Manufacturer/ Supplier/ Distributor of the supplies indicated in its bid by submitting the Manufacturer's Authorization or Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization Form."*

7.1.28 Specific requirement No. 6 in Section 2.2 of the Terms of Reference in Section 6 of the bidding document further required that *"where the bidder is not a manufacturer, the bid must be accompanied by a written letter from Scheidt and Bachmann in Germany or their authorized representative, or evidence of teaming with an authorized partner of Scheidt and Bachmann containing the manufacturers full authorization for submission of the bid and extension of support and warranty to all the systems, spares and consumables and components proposed."*

Entity's response

7.1.29 When interviewed, Ms. Nancy O. Amuge revealed that at bid closure, Samanga Utilities Limited submitted a letter from Scheidt and Bachmann guiding on the Manufacturer's Authorization, but this letter was rejected by the Evaluation Committee, who made a request for clarification to the bidder, requesting the company to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization letter or evidence of a partnership with an authorized representative as per the requirements in the bidding document. That this was in line with section 6 of the bidding document.

7.1.30 That the same grace was also extended to Live Systems Technologies, to submit their audited financial statements for 2022, which had been omitted by the bidder at bid closure. That whereas Samanga Utilities Limited responded by providing a Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization letter from Evopark Limited, an authorized distributor of Scheidt and Bachmann, Live Systems Technologies did not respond to the Evaluation Committee's request.

7.1.31 That in any case, Live Systems Technologies did not provide a Manufacturer's Authorization letter from the system manufacturer in Germany, but from another representative for Africa and Middle East, which was accepted by the Evaluation Committee.

Bidder's response

7.1.32 Mr. Katumba Ismail, Project Manager, Samanga Utilities Limited revealed in his recorded statement that during the bidding process, the bidder reached out to both Scheidt and Bachmann for a Manfacturer's Authorization letter and to Evopark Limited for a Distributor's/ Supplier's Authorization letter. That whereas the manufacturer had not yet provided the Manufacturer's Authorization Letter at bid closure, Evopark Limited had provided the same, effected through a Memorandum of Understanding on 7th March 2025, before bid closure. That it was an omission not to attach Evopark Limited's authorization letter in the bid.

PPDA Findings

7.1.33 The Authority noted that Samanga Utilities Limited omitted to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter (MAF) or a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization in its bid at the time and date of bid closure on 13th March 2025. This prompted the Evaluation Committee to issue a request for clarification requiring the bidder to submit a Manufacturer's Authorization, a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization, or evidence of teaming with an authorized partner of Scheidt and Bachmann. In response, the bidder submitted a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization and a Memorandum of Understanding between Evopark Limited (Distributor) and Samanga Utilities Limited dated 7th March 2025.

7.1.34 The Authority established that the Evaluation Committee's request to Samanga Utilities Limited to submit the Manufacturer's Authorization/Supplier/Distributor's Authorization Form was made pursuant to Regulation 6(1) and (2) of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023, to address a non-material omission. The Authority further noted that a similar opportunity was extended to Live Systems Technologies to provide audited financial statements for the year ending 2022, which had also been omitted at bid closure.

7.1.35 The Authority further established that the Supplier/Distributor's Authorization from Evopark Limited existed prior to bid closing and was only inadvertently omitted from Samanga Utilities Limited's bid at submission. Accordingly, the request for clarification by the Evaluation Committee sought submission of a document that was valid at the date of bid submission and addressed an omission rather than a material deviation.

Conclusion

7.1.36 Whereas it is true that Samanga Utilities Limited omitted to include a Manufacturer's Authorization or a Supplier/ Distributor's Authoritzation letter in their bid at the time of bid closure, there is no evidence that Ms. Nancy O. Amuge irregularly permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to submit the Manufacturer's Authorization Letter/Supplier/Distributor's Authorization since her action to request for clarification was consistent with Regulation 6(1) and (2) of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023.

7.1.37 Accordingly, the Authority finds no merit in this allegation.

Whether the Evaluation Committee and the Procurement and Disposal Unit erroneously allowed Samanga Utilities Limited to use a partnership document with a supplier/ a distributor who was not authorized by the manufacturer to operate in Uganda

7.1.38 The complainant alleged that Samanga Utilities Limited was irregularly allowed to use a partnership document with a supplier/ distributor who was not authorized by the manufacturer to operate in Uganda and would therefore be unable to implement the project and perform their contractual obligation. That the Procurement and Disposal Unit did not therefore conduct thorough due diligence to ascertain this.

Entity's response

7.1.39 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, the Chairperson Evaluation Committee stated that the Evaluation Committee correctly accepted the partnership document because Evopark Limited (formerly Paytech Limited) is an authorized partner of Schiedt and Bachmann in Germany, and the company is allowed to operate in East Africa (Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and Rwanda), as indicated on Schiedt and Bachmann's website (https://scheidt-bachmann.de/en/contact/global-presence)

PPDA Findings

7.1.40 The Authority noted that while responding to the Evaluation Committee's request for clarification, Samanga Utilities Limited submitted a Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization letter from Evopark Limited (formerly Paytech Limited), a company based in Nairobi, Kenya and a Memorandum of Understanding between Samanga Utilties Limited and Evopark Limited in relation to provision of parking management system and services. Also attached was a distribution agreement dated 4th July 2017 between Scheidt & Bachmann GmbH of Germany and Paytech Limited of Kenya.

7.1.41 Analysis of the Distribution Agreement indicated that Paytech Limited (now Evopark Limited) was granted distribution rights within a defined contract territory comprising Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Ethiopia. This demonstrated that the distributor relied upon by Samanga Utilities Limited was authorized by the manufacturer to operate within Uganda, and could therefore implement the project and perform their required contractual obligation.

7.1.42 Accordingly, the Authority established that the Evaluation Committee relied on documentary evidence confirming the distributor's authorization within the relevant geographical territory. There was therefore no evidence to support the allegation that the distributor lacked authority to operate in Uganda, nor that the Procurement and Disposal Unit failed to undertake reasonable due diligence in that regard.

Conclusion

7.1.43 The allegation that the Evaluation Committee and the Procurement and Disposal Unit erroneously allowed Samanga Utilities Limited to use a partnership document with an unauthorized distributor is not substantiated. The Authority finds no merit in this allegation.

Whether Samanga Utilities Limited met the experience requirements set out in the bidding document

7.1.44 The complainant alleged that Samanga Utilities Limited was irregularly declared as the Best Evaluated Bidder since they did not have the technical knowledge or previous experience in managing similar contracts. That Samanga Utilities Limited did not also hold a binding agreement with the system manufacturer.

7.1.45 Specific requirement No. 13 on section 2: Support and maintenance requirements in the Terms of Reference in the bidding document (page 51) provided the work experience required of a bidder. Specifically, it was indicated that "*The bidder shall submit with the bid document evidence of his experience working with similar car parking systems in large establishments. The bidder shall have at least three years working experience with similar car parking systems.*"

Entity's response

7.1.46 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Chairperson, Evaluation Committee revealed that Samanga Utilities Limited had the required experience in managing automated car parking and toll gate systems in large establishments as required in the bidding document.

7.1.47 That from its establishment in 2018, Samanga Utilities Limited has managed automated car parking systems in Makerere University which has three toll gates, Lugogo mall with two toll gate and forest mall with two toll gates. That this experience is adequate for managing and maintaining the relatively smaller scope of two toll gates at Entebbe International Airport.

7.1.48 That Live Systems Technologies, the other bidder in this procurement was established in 2021 and had only two years' experience in supporting and maintaining similar car parks, which experience they obtained from their first contract to manage the same at Entebbe International Airport, a contract which they failed to fully deliver on.

7.1.49 Pertaining the allegation that Samanga Utilities Limited did not hold a binding agreement with the system manufacturer, Ms. Amuge stated that the bidder had a Memorandum of Understanding and a Supplier/ Distributor's Authorization with/from Evopark Limited, an authorized distributor of the system manufacturer as required in the bidding document. That this represented a binding agreement with the manufacturer to accord the Entity the desired quality of service in accordance with the contract.

Bidder's response

7.1.50 Mr. Katumba Ismail, the Project Manager, Samanga Utilities Limited confirmed Ms. Amuge's statement. He added that Samanga Utilities Limited has experience of five years in regard to working with parking technology and automated payment machines, compared to the three years' experience required by the Entity in their bidding document.

PPDA Findings

7.1.51 Upon analysis of Samanga Utilities Limited's bid, the Authority observed that the bidder attached four contracts as evidence of relevant experience. These were examined to determine compliance with the minimum experience requirement.

7.1.52 The first contract, signed on 31st March 2021, was for the provision of traffic control management services at Makerere University Main Campus for a period of five years. The scope of work included upgrading the existing system to current technology, maintaining the traffic management system, undertaking traffic control activities, providing personnel to operate and administer the system, manning pay machines and cash booths, and revenue collection and remittance. This contract demonstrated experience in managing an automated traffic and car parking system in a large establishment.

7.1.53 The second contract was with Kampala Capital City Authority for the provision of parking lot management services at Plot M.736 Cooper Road, Kisementi, Kampala City. The third contract, signed on 8th September 2023 with Yasser Kassem Ahmed, covered the supply, installation and management of an automated car park management system and security services for Lugogo Mall valued at USD 249,230. The fourth contract dated 17th January 2024 was signed with Kyambogo University for the provision of automated traffic management and car parking services.

7.1.54 From the foregoing, the Authority established that Samanga Utilities Limited had been providing traffic management and automated car parking services since March 2021. As at the bid closing date of 10th March 2025, the bidder had accumulated approximately four years of relevant experience. This exceeded the minimum requirement of three years specified in the bidding document. The Authority therefore determined that Samanga Utilities Limited met the experience requirement.

7.1.55 Regarding the allegation that Samanga Utilities Limited did not hold a binding agreement with the system manufacturer, the Authority examined the bid submitted and noted that the bidder provided a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization from Evopark Limited, a distributor of Scheidt and Bachmann GmbH, the system manufacturer. The bidder also submitted a valid Memorandum of Understanding with Evopark Limited for provision of the parking management system.

7.1.56 The bidding document required either a Manufacturer's Authorization Letter issued by Scheidt and Bachmann GmbH, or a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization issued by an authorized partner or distributor of the manufacturer. The documentation submitted by Samanga Utilities Limited satisfied this requirement. Furthermore, the Memorandum of Understanding signed on 7th March 2025 constituted a binding arrangement between Samanga Utilities Limited and Evopark Limited, which in turn had a binding distributor's agreement with the system manufacturer.

Conclusion

7.1.57 Based on the foregoing analysis, the Authority finds that Samanga Utilities Limited satisfied the minimum experience requirement of three years working with similar automated car parking systems in large establishments, having demonstrated approximately four years of relevant experience at the time of bid closing.

7.1.58 Additionally, the bidder submitted a valid Supplier/Distributor's Authorization and Memorandum of Understanding with Evopark Limited, an authorized distributor of the system manufacturer, thereby meeting the requirement for a binding manufacturer or distributor authorization.

7.1.59 The Authority finds **no merit** in this allegation.

Whether Samanga Utilities Limited irregularly increased the cost of maintenance and support for the car park system at Entebbe International Airport from UGX 31,600,000 to UGX 50,000,000 per month

7.1.60 The complainant alleged that the bidder irregularly increased the cost of maintenance and support for the car park system at Entebbe International Airport under a two years' framework contract. That the monthly rate was raised from UGX 31,600,000 to UGX 50,000,000, thereby resulting in an overcharge if UGX 441,600,000 for the two years.

7.1.61 Section 51 of the PPDA Act, Cap 205 states that *"All procurement and disposal shall be conducted in a manner which promotes economy, efficiency and value for money."*

Entity's response

7.1.62 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge, Chairperson Evaluation Committee and Contract Manager stated that UGX 50,000,000 monthly charge was reasonable. She further stated that the monthly charge by Live Systems Technologies Africa (U) Ltd in the recently concluded contract was not UGX 31,600,000, but UGX 38,570,850 (VAT inclusive).

That whereas the monthly rate of UGX 38,570,850 charged by Live Systems Technologies Africa (U) Ltd in the recently concluded contract seems lower than Samanga Utilities Limited's UGX 50,000,000, it had other incidental costs that were charged on the Entity by the service provider including spare parts installation fees and monthly transaction fees for mobile money transactions collected through a third party agent, as a percentage of total revenue collected by the Entity through mobile money. That Samanga Utilities Limited's UGX 50,000,000 was a one off monthly payment without any other additional incidental costs.

That Samanga Utilities offer of UGX 50,000,000 as a fixed monthly rate was viewed as reasonable considering that the Entity would get two full time technical support and one dedicated project manager and the planned hardware revamp expected to increase the scope of maintenance during the two-year period. That this cost was within the Entity's annual budget for car park system maintenance under budget line 85-700 of UGX. 617,241,657 for each of the two financial years, which translates to UGX 51,436,804 per month.

That, these reasons, together with considerations for the time value of money in the period from 2019 to 2025 provided justification for the Entity accepting the price quoted by the bidder

Bidder's response

7.1.63 Mr. Katumba Ismail, Project Manager in his response revealed that the UGX 50,000,000 per month charge was what the company costed to be sufficient to provide satisfactory service to the Entity. The UGX 50,000,000 was broken down as below:

Table 2: Breakdown of Quoted Price

Category	Amount (UGX)
Human Resources (Operations and support staff on shift basis)	18,000,000
System Servicing and preventive maintenance	7,000,000
Remote assistance and escalation	5,000,000
Software, IT support and training	5,500,000
Consumables and utilities	5,500,000
VAT (18%)	9,000,000
Total	**50,000,000**

PPDA Findings

7.1.64 The Authority established that Samanga Utilities Limited quoted a monthly fee of UGX 50,000,000 (VAT inclusive) for the provision of maintenance and support services for the car park system. This price was comprehensive, covering system servicing and maintenance, remote assistance and escalation, software and IT support, training, consumables, utilities, contingencies, and associated human resource costs. The quoted amount was subjected to evaluation, found responsive, and subsequently incorporated into the signed contract.

7.1.65 The Authority noted that the Entity committed a total of UGX 680,318,389 for the first year of the contract. This commitment was effected through Procurement Requisition (Form 5) dated 13th December 2024 of UGX 380,318,389, and a subsequent Procurement Requisition dated 29th September 2025, through which the Accounting Officer confirmed additional funding of UGX 300,000,000. When prorated over 12 months period (December 2025 to December 2026) for the first year of the contract whose funding was confirmed, this translates to an average monthly budgetary provision of UGX 56,693,199.

7.1.66 The Entity consequently assessed Samanga Utilities Ltd's bid price of UGX 50,000,000 per mnth (UGX 600,000,000 per year) and confirmed that it was within the available funds of UGX 680,318,389 for the first year of the contract and the Entity's recurrent yearly budget of UGX 617,241,657.

7.1.67 In contrast, the Authority established that the price quoted by Samanga Utilities Limited was structured as a fixed, consolidated monthly fee with no additional incidental charges, thereby enhancing cost predictability and eliminating variable expenses that had characterized the previous contract. When these additional costs under the previous arrangement are taken into account, the apparent price difference is significantly narrowed and does not represent a like-for-like comparison.

7.1.68 The Authority also noted that the scope of services under the current contract was broader than that under the previous arrangement. The contract with Samanga Utilities Limited provided for two full-time technical support personnel and a dedicated project manager, as well as a planned hardware revamp expected to increase maintenance demands over the contract period. These additional service elements reasonably contributed to the higher contract price and reflect an enhancement in service delivery rather than an arbitrary increase in cost.

Conclusion

7.1.69 There is no evidence of overcharge or irregular price escalation in the procurement of maintenance and support services for the car park system. The contract price of UGX 50,000,000 was competitively determined, evaluated, and found to be within the Entity's approved budget. Accordingly, the Authority finds **No Merit** in this allegation.

Whether the Evaluation Committee irregularly permitted a Joint Venture partnership with Samanga Utilities Limited to validate the company's qualification to provide maintenance and support services

7.1.70 It was alleged that the Evaluation Committee permitted a Joint Venture partnership with another company to validate Samanga Utilities Limited's qualification to provide maintenance and support services. That this decision contravened procurement requirements which would have automatically disqualified Samanga Utilities Limited under the PPDA Act and Regulations.

7.1.71 Sub-Section 3.2 of Section 3: Evaluation Methodology and Criteria states that: *"Bids submitted by a Joint Venture or consortium of two or more firms shall include all the above information for eligibility for each member of the Joint Venture and be accompanied by a Joint Venture or Consortium agreement."*

Entity's response

7.1.72 Ms. Nancy O. Amuge stated that Samanga Utilities Limited did not form a Joint Venture with any company.

Bidder's response

Mr. Katumba Ismail refuted the allegation that the company formed a Joint Venture with Evopark Limited. That the same would have been expressly stated in the company's bid, if it was true.

PPDA Findings

7.1.73 The Authority observed that Samanga Utilities Limited submitted a Supplier/Distributor's Authorization from Evopark Limited, together with a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the two entities relating to the provision of a parking management system and associated services.

7.1.74 Upon analysis of these documents, the Authority established that the submitted documents did not amount to a Joint Venture. A valid Joint Venture must be formalized through a Joint Venture Agreement that clearly defines the legal relationship between the parties, including joint and several liability, shared responsibilities, governance arrangements, and the extent of each party's participation in contract execution.

7.1.75 In this case, the Supplier/Distributor's Authorization merely permitted Samanga Utilities Limited to distribute or implement solutions associated with Evopark Limited, while the MoU outlined a general framework for cooperation. Neither document created a binding partnership with the legal and financial characteristics of a Joint Venture. Notably, there was no evidence of joint liability, shared risk, or a defined structure for joint execution of the contract.

7.1.76 The Evaluation Committee did not therefore permit a Joint Venture partnership with another company to validate Samanga Utilities Limited's qualification and experience, since there was no Joint Venture in the first place. In any case, permission of companies to form Joint Ventures or not does not lie with the Evaluation Committee.

Conclusion

7.1.77 The relationship between Samanga Utilities Limited and Evopark Limited did not meet the threshold of a Joint Venture and should not be considered as one. The Authority finds **No Merit** in this allegation.

Whether the Procurement and Disposal Unit irregularly invited the bidder for contract signing before concluding a dispute over the procurement process

7.1.78 It was alleged that the Procurement and Disposal Unit irregularly invited Samanga Utilities Limited for contract signing before conclusion of a dispute over the procurement process. That whereas Live System Technologies Africa (U) Limited submitted a complaint to the Procurement and Disposal Unit, the same officials instead invited Samanga Utilities Limited for contract signing contrary to the PPDA Act and Regulations.

7.1.79 Section 106(1), (5) & (7) of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205 states that "*A bidder who is aggrieved by a decision of a Procuring and Disposing Entity may make a complaint to the Accounting Officer of the Procuring and Disposing Entity.*"

"*On receiving the complaint, the Accounting Officer shall immediately suspend the procurement or disposal process, as the case may be.*"

"*The Accounting Officer shall, within ten days of receipt of a complaint, make and communicate a decision, in writing, addressed to the bidder who makes the complaint and which shall indicate the reasons for the decision taken and the corrective measure to be taken, if any.*"

Entity's response

7.1.80 Mr. Augustine Amolu, Assistant Procurement Officer who handled the procurement refuted the allegation. He stated that the Administrative Review complaint disputing the procurement process was dismissed on 12th August 2025 through a letter addressed to Live Systems Technologies Africa (Uganda) Limited. That after the stipulated timeline in which the bidder could escalate the complaint to the PPDA Appeals Tribunal had passed, the file was forwarded to the Legal Department on 4th September 2025 for contract preparation. That the contract was consequently signed on 3rd December 2025, long after dismissal of the complaint.

PPDA Findings

7.1.81 A review of the procurement records confirmed that Live Systems Technologies Africa (U) Limited lodged an application for administrative review on 28th July 2025, challenging the evaluation outcome following publication of the Best Evaluated Bidder on 18th July 2025. The complaint was premised on the bidder's disqualification for failure to submit audited accounts for the year ending 2022 prepared by a firm registered with the Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Uganda, which the bidder asserted had been included in its submission.

7.1.82 The Authority established that the Accounting Officer reviewed the complaint and, on 12th August 2025, issued a written decision dismissing it for lack of merit. The Authority did not come across any evidence on record to indicate that the complainant escalated the matter to the PPDA Appeals Tribunal within the prescribed timelines after receiving the Accounting Officer's decision.

7.1.83 Consequently, the Manager Procurement formally requested the Company Secretary to prepare a contract for the maintenance and support of the car park system at Entebbe International Airport under a two-year framework arrangement. The contract was later signed by Samanga Utilities Limited on 18th November 2025 and by the Accounting Officer on 3rd December 2025.

7.1.84 A review of the sequence of events indicates that all actions relating to contract preparation and signing were undertaken well after the complaint had been conclusively handled and the appeal window had lapsed, in accordance with Section 106 of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205.

Conclusion

7.1.85 No evidence was found to indicate that contract signing activities or invitations to sign the contract were undertaken prior to the resolution of the complaint or within the standstill period. The Authority finds No Merit in this allegation.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Arising from the above findings, the inspection of the procurement process for the Maintenance of the Car Park System at Entebbe International Airport is hereby concluded and closed.