

SECTION 2.2: FUNCTIONALITY EVALUATION CRITERION

- (a) Reference Scoring: A maximum of 100 points will be awarded at the sole discretion of the Municipality's Bid Evaluation Committee based on the information provided and will be split as follows.

CRITERIA	POINTS
1. <u>Experience - Company profile to be provided which consists of the following:</u> a) Must be on the letterhead of the company; b) Background of what the company does; c) How long the company has been operating; d) Clients for whom similar work has been done	10
2. References (4)	20
3. <u>Approach and Method</u> a) Technical Innovative Approach to be submitted with proposal b) Organogram to be submitted with bid c) Business Plan d) Socio Economic Objectives e) Project Schedule	70
Total	100

Criteria will be evaluated as follow:

1. Experience (Company profile to be provided as stated above)

1	Experience	Points
	a. More than 15 years	10
	b. More than 10 to 15 years	8
	c. More than 8 to 10 years	5
	d. More than 4 to 8 years	3
	e. More than 2 to 4 years	1
	f. No experience	0
	Total	

2. References

The Bidder is hereby requested to provide a minimum of **4 contactable references**. The references **must** complete, score and sign **Form A1 to A4**: Original Completed Form A1 to A4 to be included in the tender documentation. Points for References will be allocated as indicated in the tables below. Please note that the information provided will be verified by the Municipality. Please note that only the prescribe Form A attached to this tender will be accepted. Bidders to note that no alternative reference sheets will be accepted. Incomplete or unclear reference sheets will not be accepted, and zero points will allocated for such references. **The completed form A document, included in this document, is the only document which will be accepted for the bidder to score points.**

FORM A1: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER**Background information of Nominated Referees**

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referee:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
Design and Tender readiness as per program and timely Submission of all reports up to close out stage,	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
What was the quality of the report submitted?	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were created during the Project Initiation Stage?	Exceed initial expectations (2 points)
	Met expectations (1 point)
	Did not meet expectations (0 points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was the <i>progress reporting done with, transparency and openness</i> ?	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)
PROFESSIONALISM (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

Additional Remarks/Comments:

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above information is, to the best of my knowledge, correct and a true reflection.

.....
Reference Signature

.... / / 2025
Date of Declaration

FORM A2: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER**Background information of Nominated Referees**

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referee:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
Design and Tender readiness as per program and timely Submission of all reports up to close out stage,	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
What was the quality of the report submitted?	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were created during the Project Initiation Stage?	Exceed initial expectations (2 points)
	Met expectations (1 point)
	Did not meet expectations (0 points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was the <i>progress reporting done with, transparency and openness?</i>	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)
PROFESSIONALISM (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (2 points)
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

Additional Remarks/Comments:

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above information is, to the best of my knowledge, correct and a true reflection.

.....

Reference Signature

.... / / 2025

Date of Declaration

FORM A3: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER**Background information of Nominated Referees**

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referee:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
Design and Tender readiness as per program and timely Submission of all reports up to close out stage,	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS**(2 POINTS)**

Question	Answer
What was the quality of the report submitted?	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	Good (1 point)
	Poor (0 points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were created during the Project Initiation Stage?	<u>Exceed initial expectations (2 points)</u>
	Met expectations (1 point)
	Did not meet expectations (0 points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was the <i>progress reporting done with, transparency and openness?</i>	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	<u>Good (1 point)</u>
	Poor (0 points)
PROFESSIONALISM (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	<u>Good (1 point)</u>
	Poor (0 points)

Additional Remarks/Comments:

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above information is, to the best of my knowledge, correct and a true reflection.

.....
Reference Signature

.... / / 2025
Date of Declaration

FORM A4: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER**Background information of Nominated Referees**

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referee:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Design and Tender readiness as per program and timely Submission of all reports up to close out stage,	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>	
	Good (1 point)	
	Poor (0 points)	

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the report submitted?	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>	
	Good (1 point)	
	Poor (0 points)	

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were created during the Project Initiation Stage?	<u>Exceed initial expectations (2 points)</u>
	Met expectations (1 point)
	Did not meet expectations (0 points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Was the <i>progress reporting</i> done with, transparency and openness?	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	<u>Good (1 point)</u>
	Poor (0 points)
PROFESSIONALISM (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	<u>Excellent (2 points)</u>
	<u>Good (1 point)</u>
	Poor (0 points)

Additional Remarks/Comments:

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the above information is, to the best of my knowledge, correct and a true reflection.

.....
Reference Signature

.... / / 2025
Date of Declaration

3. Approach and Method

SCOREBOARD				
Category	Evidence Required	Criteria	Points	Claimed
This criterion will be evaluated as follows:				
Poor		The technical approach and / or methodology is poor / is unlikely to satisfy project objectives or requirements. The tenderer has misunderstood certain aspects of the scope of work and does not deal with the critical aspects of the project. The activity schedule omits important tasks or the timing of the activities and correlation among them are inconsistent with the approach paper. There is lack of clarity and logic in the sequencing.		
Fair		The approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and requirements. The approach does not adequately deal with the critical characteristics of the project. The methodology is too generic. All key activities are included in the activity schedule but are not detailed. There are minor inconsistencies between timing, project deliverables and the proposed approach.		
Excellent		The approach is specifically tailored to address the specific project objectives and requirements and is sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes that may occur during execution. The methodology is specifically tailored to the critical characteristics of the project. The work plan fits the approach paper well; all important activities are indicated in the activity schedule and their timing and sequencing is appropriate and consistent with project objectives and requirements. There is a fair degree of detail that facilitates understanding of the proposed work plan.		
DRAFT PROJECT METHODOLOGY PROPOSAL	a) Technical Innovative Approach to be submitted with proposal b) Business profile and Organogram to be submitted with bid c) Business Plan d) Socio Economic Objectives e) Project Schedule	a) Service delivery proposal addressing the functions and services listed in the scope of the tender; Innovation and design; Strengthen the unique character of towns within the Hessequa Municipal Area. (For example: Internet Access Points for the community) b) Demonstrate how you would support this Interoperability solution and indicate the ease of support and maintenance of the solution, i.e: - Technical competencies and consulting capabilities. - Number of support resources (including third party). How many based locally in Hessequa? - Geographic reach, including local support c) Complete Business Plan detailing: - Financial model (costing and time frame); - Fee structure; - Cash flow projections; - Standard operating procedure and organogram; & Maintenance programme and costing. d) Indicate how your solution will create local economic opportunities, through the deployment of your solution, you would contribute to the achievement of the following city goals - Developing local ICT skills and retaining them in Hessequa - Growing SMME's and making them sustainable	70	

		- Encouraging investment in local economy - The money that the municipality spends not only circulates in the local economy, but also benefits the citizens of this town. e) Time and ease of implementation to fully complete the implementation e) Excellent Proposal = 70 f) Fair Proposal = 50 g) Poor Proposal = 20		
--	--	---	--	--

NB: Bidders claiming points for functionality, without providing adequate evidence to substantiate their claims, will result in their disqualification from the tender if it is discovered prior to the awarding of the tender. Refer to important special conditions.

A bidder that scores less than 70 points out of 100 in respect of "functionality" will be regarded as submitting a non-responsive proposal and will be disqualified.

The proposal scoring the highest points for price and preference will normally be awarded the contract although the Municipality reserves the right to make an award, at its sole discretion, to any bidders or combination of bidders.

EVIDENCE OF FUNCTIONALITY SHOULD BE ATTACHED IN AN ANNEXURE ATTACHED TO THE TENDER DOCUMENT.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE THE INFORMATION AS STATED ABOVE, WILL RESULT IN NO POINTS BEING AWARDED TO THE TENDERER.

DECLARATION

I, THE UNDERSIGNED (NAME)

CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ABOVE IS CORRECT. I ACCEPT THAT THE MUNICIPALITY MAY ACT AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

AUTHORISED SIGNATURE:

NAME:

CAPACITY:

DATE: