

ANNEXURE B
TECHNICAL EVALUATION

1. Phase 1: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

At this phase bidders must submit the required supporting documents to substantiate compliance to the following requirements. It must be noted that if the Bidder does not meet any of the mandatory requirements, the bidder will be disqualified and not be evaluated further.

No.	Mandatory	Comply	Not Comply
1.1	<p>Bidder's Project Lead must be registered with a recognized professional body</p> <p>Bidder must submit Proof of Professional registration with South Africa Council of Architectural Professions (SACAP) or an equivalent</p>		
	Substantiate / Comments		

No.	Mandatory	Comply	Not Comply
1.2	<p>Bidder must have a valid Compensational for Occupational Injuries and Diseases Act (COIDA) certificate</p> <p>Bidder must submit a valid COIDA certificate</p>		
	Substantiate / Comments		

2. Phase 2 Technical Evaluation Criteria

Bidders will be evaluated according to the below technical evaluation criteria. Minimum Technical Threshold is **75%**. It must be noted that if the Bidder does not meet the **75%** minimum threshold, the bidder will be disqualified and not be evaluated further.

Minimum Technical Threshold 75%			
Technical Information	Scoring	Proof of documents	Weighting Percentage
2.1 Company Experience			
<p>The company must have successfully delivered projects where similar services were been rendered.</p> <p>The reference letter signed by the client and be on the client's letterhead and include the company name, contact person, and contact details (e.g., telephone number or email address) and it should indicate when the service was done,</p> <p>The reference letter must be clear on the nature of the work completed, duration and value of contract, including feedback from client about the quality of the service provided.</p>		Signed Client Reference Letters on a client's letterhead with total cost of the project, project execution duration, and confirmation of completion	30%
5 and more reference letters projects completed	5		
4 reference letters for projects completed	4		
3 reference letters for projects completed	3		
2 reference letters for projects completed	2		
1 reference letter for projects completed	1		
0 reference letters for projects completed Projects completed or irrelevant letters submitted	0		
Technical Information	Scoring	Proof of documents	Weighting Percentage
2.2 Experience of the Project Lead			
<p>The Project lead assigned to the project must have experience in leading and implementing similar projects.</p> <p>Provide a C.V. of the Project Lead, detailing years of experience in executing similar projects.</p>		Project Lead CV detailing same experience	20%
10 and more years of experience in similar projects	5		
> 8 but < 10 years' experience in similar projects	4		
8 years' experience in similar projects	3		
> 5 but < 8 years' experience in similar projects	2		

5 years' experience in similar projects	1		
< 5 years' experience in similar projects	0		
Technical Information	Scoring	Proof of documents	Weighting Percentage
2.3 Bidder's Methodology			
<p>Bidder must submit a comprehensive Commencement Methodology which details the following:</p> <p>a) Work plan indicating work breakdown structure, schedule, major milestones, costing per milestone, resource allocation, and logic to reach works completion.</p> <p>b) Work plan containing information on site works execution integration with other activities.</p> <p>c) Provision of safety appointments and risk mitigation.</p> <p>d) Work plan indicates access control resources and management process.</p> <p>e) Workplan provided in power point presentation format.</p> <p>Note that the following scoring matrix will be used to evaluate these criteria:</p>		<p>Bidder's proposal with Methodology indicating the program, milestones, costing, safety and risk, access control, and power point presentation format.</p>	<p>50%</p>
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all the 5 listed areas of focus	5		
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all 4 of the 5 listed areas of focus	4		
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses 3 areas of the 5 listed areas of focus	3		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 2 of the 5 listed areas of focus	2		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 1 of the 5 listed areas of focus	1		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses none of the 5 listed areas of focus	0		

3. Phase 3: Demonstration of concept /Proof of concept evaluation

Bidders who met the minimum functionality threshold in phase 2 will be further evaluated according to the below evaluation criteria. Minimum Threshold for this phase is 70%. It must be noted that if the Bidder does not meet the 70% minimum threshold, the bidder will be disqualified and not be evaluated further.

Technical Information	Scoring	Proof of documents	Weighting Percentage
<p>3.1 Presented solution must meet the following strategic planning support functionalities.</p> <p>1. The incorporation of the scope of work into key performance indicators of project performance</p> <p>2. The project must state early warning notification to client, including the escalation process for written management approval.</p>		Presentation	30%

<p>3. Production of options considered leading to the decision making of final selected option.</p> <p>Note that the following scoring matrix will be used to evaluate these criteria:</p>			
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all the listed areas of focus</p>	5		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses 2 areas of the 3 listed areas of focus</p>	3		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 1 of the 3 listed areas of focus</p>	1		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses none of the listed areas of focus</p>	0		
<p style="text-align: center;">Technical Information</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Scoring</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proof of documents</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Weighting Percentage</p>
<p>3.2 Presented solution must meet a weekly and performance reporting functionality.</p> <p>a) Clear evaluation process of plans, performance gaps, and root cause diagnoses.</p> <p>b) Ease of generation of weekly and monthly performance reports.</p> <p>c) Illustration of implementation progress tracking against budget against project plan.</p> <p>d) Projection of risk management processes to track risks linked to the project.</p> <p>e) Narrative reporting illustration.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Presentation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">40%</p>
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all the listed areas of focus</p>	5		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses 4 or 3 areas of the 5 listed areas of focus</p>	3		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 2 or 1 of the 5 listed areas of focus</p>	1		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses none of the listed areas of focus</p>	0		
<p style="text-align: center;">Technical Information</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Scoring</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proof of documents</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Weighting Percentage</p>
<p>3.3 The bidder must provide site visit that will provide actual proposed plants, plant containers, furniture, and proposed portrait, and portrait frames.</p> <p>Note that the following scoring matrix will be used to evaluate these criteria:</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Actual from site visit</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">30%</p>
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all the listed areas of focus</p>	5		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach addresses 4 or 3 areas of the 5 listed areas of focus</p>	3		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 2 or 1 of the 5 listed areas of focus</p>	1		
<p>Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses none of the listed areas of focus</p>	0		

Presented solution must meet a weekly and performance reporting functionality. a) Clear evaluation process of plans, performance gaps, and root cause diagnoses. b) Ease of generation of weekly and monthly performance reports. c) Illustration of implementation progress tracking against budget against project plan. d) Projection of risk management processes to track risks linked to the project. e) Narrative reporting illustration.			
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all the 5 listed areas of focus	5		
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses all 4 of the 5 listed areas of focus	4		
Bidder's methodology and approach addresses 3 areas of the 5 listed areas of focus	3		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 2 of the 5 listed areas of focus	2		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses 1 of the 5 listed areas of focus	1		
Bidder's methodology and approach to addresses none of the 5 listed areas of focus	0		

4. Phase 4: Commercial evaluation

CEF (SOC) Ltd will utilise the following formula in its evaluation of Price offers:

[Weighted score 80 points]

$$PS = 80 \left(1 - \frac{Pt - Pmin}{Pmin} \right)$$

Where:

Ps = Score for the Tender under consideration

Pt = Price of Tender under consideration

Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable Tender

Preference points/specific goals criteria

[Weighted score 20 points]

Specific goals / Preference Points Claim

Evaluation Criteria	Final Weighted Scores
Price	80
Specific goals	20
TOTAL SCORE:	100

A maximum of 20 points will be awarded to a tenderer for specific goals specified for the tender/RFQ as follows:

Specific goals	Points
Historically disadvantaged individual (HDI)	
Enterprises with ownership of 51% or more by person/s who are black	10
Enterprises with ownership of 51% or more by person/s who are women	5
Enterprises with ownership of 51% or more by person/s who are youth	3
Enterprise with ownership of 10% or more by person/s with disability	2
Total	20

Tenders must submit their B_BBEE certificate issued by an authorized body or person or a B-BBEE sworn affidavit to claim preference points.

- The points scored for the specific goal must be added to the points scored for price and the total must be rounded off to the nearest two decimal places.
- The contract must be awarded to the tenderer scoring the highest points.
- If two or more tenders score an equal total number of points, the contract must be awarded to the tenderer that scored the highest points for specific goals, and if two or more tenderers score equal total points in all respects, the award must be decided by the drawing of lots.