

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. Proposed Methodology / Project Plan	60
2. Experience - Company profile to be provided which consists of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be on the letterhead of the company; • Background of what the company does; • How long the company has been operating; • Clients for whom similar work has been done; • Illustrate that the bidder is familiar with terminology related to local government. 	20
3. Expertise	20
Total	100

1. Important notes:

- (i) Bidders that score less than 70 out of 100 points for the functionality criteria will be regarded as submitting a non-responsive Bid and will not be evaluated on (preference points).
- (ii) Bidders must ensure that all the information requested is provided in detail. Failure on the bidder part to provide the evidence required to award points will result in no points being awarded for that criteria.
- (iii) Unclear or incomplete information provided will result in no points being allocated.
- (iv) Bidders must submit applicable information for this tender. Reference to any attached documentation must be clearly indicated.
- (v) Points will be allocated in terms of the evidence provided by the bidder. If the information provided during the course of the evaluation of contract are known to be false, the municipality will reserve the right not to award points or cancel the contract.
- (vi) Tenderers that do not supply the information in the above prescribed format or omit to provide the required evidence will not be awarded points for this section.

Criteria will be evaluated as follow:

CRITERIA	Score
1 Project Plan	
a. Methodology and detailed project plan provided in MSProject for each phase with timelines, demonstrating knowledge of local government powers and functions and the application of design criteria.	60
b. Methodology and detailed project plan provided in MS Project demonstrating knowledge of local government powers and functions and the application of design criteria.	30
c. No detailed project plan provided.	0
Total	

2	Experience	
	a. 5 or more References for organizational reviews in Local Government/Public service conducted within the past 10 years with contactable references.	20
	b. 4 References for organizational reviews in Local Government/Public service conducted within the past 10 years with contactable references.	16
	c. 3 References for organizational reviews in Local Government/Public service conducted within the past 10 years with contactable references.	12
	d. 2 References for organizational reviews in Local Government/Public service conducted within the past 10 years with contactable references.	8
	e. 1 Reference for an organizational review in Local Government/Public service conducted within the past 10 years with contactable references.	4
	Total	
3	Expertise	
	a. 5 years of related Expertise conducting organizational reviews from conception to implementation, with a suitable Degree in either Business Management, Industrial Engineering, Technology, or digital systems and process optimization.	20
	b. 3 to 4 or more years related Expertise with a suitable Degree in either Business Management, Industrial Engineering, Technology, or digital systems and process optimization.	12
	c. 1 to 2 or more years related Expertise with a suitable Degree in either Business Management, Industrial Engineering, Technology, or digital systems and process optimization.	8
	d. No related expertise in conducting organizational reviews	0
	Total	

The Bidder is hereby requested to provide a minimum of **5 contactable references**. Points for References will be allocated as indicated in the tables below.

Points will be allocated as per points allocation per question.

The references must be related to the appointment of a service provider to conduct an organisational review of the staff establishment in the past 10 years.

FORM A: 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:	

QUALITY		(2 POINTS)
Question:	Answer	
Was the final organisational review report provided of good quality?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s show in-depth knowledge of Local Government/Public Service challenges and legal frameworks?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

KNOWLEDGE		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s propose practical solutions?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

PROFESSIONALISM		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant meet the project deadlines and deliverables?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SATISFACTION		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant interact with all stakeholders to extract maximum participation and input?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

RETURN ON INVESTMENT		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Were the proposals implemented and did they positively effect on service delivery?	Yes (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.

Signature of Deponent

Date of declaration

Total marks for each reference will be divided by 2 and added to Functionality score for Experience to add up to a possible mark out of 20.

FORM A: 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:	

QUALITY		(2 POINTS)
Question:	Answer	
Was the final organisational review report provided of good quality?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s show in-depth knowledge of Local Government/Public Service challenges and legal frameworks?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

KNOWLEDGE		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s propose practical solutions?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

PROFESSIONALISM		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant meet the project deadlines and deliverables?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SATISFACTION		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant interact with all stakeholders to extract maximum participation and input?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

RETURN ON INVESTMENT		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Were the proposals implemented and did they positively effect on service delivery?	Yes (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.

Signature of Deponent

Date of declaration

Total marks for each reference will be divided by 2 and added to Functionality score for Experience to add up to a possible mark out of 20.

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

FORM A: 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:	

QUALITY		(2 POINTS)
Question:	Answer	
Was the final organisational review report provided of good quality?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s show in-depth knowledge of Local Government/Public Service challenges and legal frameworks?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

KNOWLEDGE		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s propose practical solutions?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

PROFESSIONALISM		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant meet the project deadlines and deliverables?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SATISFACTION		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant interact with all stakeholders to extract maximum participation and input?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

RETURN ON INVESTMENT		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Were the proposals implemented and did they positively effect on service delivery?	Yes (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.

Signature of Deponent

Date of declaration

Total marks for each reference will be divided by 2 and added to Functionality score for Experience to add up to a possible mark out of 20.

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

FORM A: 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:	

QUALITY		(2 POINTS)
Question:	Answer	
Was the final organisational review report provided of good quality?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s show in-depth knowledge of Local Government/Public Service challenges and legal frameworks?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

KNOWLEDGE		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s propose practical solutions?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

PROFESSIONALISM		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant meet the project deadlines and deliverables?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SATISFACTION		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant interact with all stakeholders to extract maximum participation and input?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

RETURN ON INVESTMENT		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Were the proposals implemented and did they positively effect on service delivery?	Yes (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.

Signature of Deponent

Date of declaration

Total marks for each reference will be divided by 2 and added to Functionality score for Experience to add up to a possible mark out of 20.

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

FORM A: 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:	

QUALITY		(2 POINTS)
Question:	Answer	
Was the final organisational review report provided of good quality?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s show in-depth knowledge of Local Government/Public Service challenges and legal frameworks?	Yes (2 Points)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

KNOWLEDGE		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant/s propose practical solutions?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

PROFESSIONALISM		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant meet the project deadlines and deliverables?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

SATISFACTION		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the consultant interact with all stakeholders to extract maximum participation and input?	Yes (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

RETURN ON INVESTMENT		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Were the proposals implemented and did they positively effect on service delivery?	Yes (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.

Signature of Deponent

Date of declaration

Total marks for each reference will be divided by 2 and added to Functionality score for Experience to add up to a possible mark out of 20.

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 Bidder that scores 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 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:

Initials of Service Provider’s Authority: