

**SECTION 2.2: FUNCTIONALITY EVALUATION CRITERION**

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
<b>1. <u>Service Providers, Skills, Competencies and Experience</u></b>  1.1 Company Profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be presented on the official company letterhead.</li> <li>• Include background information on the company, years of operation, and relevant qualifications and registrations (e.g., SACPLAN, SAIPA, ECSA, GIS accreditation).</li> </ul> 1.2 Relevant Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a list of clients for whom similar Capital Expenditure Framework or municipal planning work has been done.</li> <li>• Highlight the number and scope of projects managed.</li> </ul>	50
<b>2. <u>Interpretation of the Terms of Reference and Quality of the Methodology and Project Plan Presented</u></b>  2.1 Work Breakdown Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a detailed WBS showing tasks, allocated resources, and timeframes.</li> </ul> 2.2 Team and Budget Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a schedule of team members with roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>• Include a detailed budget and cash flow/payment schedule that corresponds with project phases.</li> </ul>	20
<b>3. References</b>	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

Criteria will be evaluated as follow:

1. Experience

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

TOTAL WEIGHTING = 50	MAX VALUE	SERVICE PROVIDERS, SKILLS, COMPETENCIES AND EXPERIENCE
Qualification and registration Weighting = 30		Key practitioner(s) are qualified and registered as required or accredited (where professional registration does not apply):
	10	1. Project Manager: Degree in town and regional planning and registered and in good standing with SACPLAN or Degree in Finance and Registered with SAIPA ( <b>Failure will lead to disqualification of bidder</b> )
	5	2. Degree in engineering and registered with ECSA
	10	3. Degree in finance and registered with SAIPA / Degree in town and regional planning and registered and in good standing with SACPLAN
	5	4. Appropriate B-degree accredited GIS qualification
Project Management Weighting = 20	20	Project Manager / Team with proven management skills and experience in undertaking and managing between 5 – 8 CEF-projects or projects of similar scope and character to that envisioned in these terms of reference
	15	Project Manager / Team with proven management skills and experience in undertaking and managing 3 – 4 CEF-projects or projects of similar scope and character to that envisioned in these terms of reference
	10	Project Manager / Team with proven management skills and experience in undertaking and managing 1 – 3 CEF-projects or projects of similar scope and character to that envisioned in these terms of reference
	0	Project Manager / Team with no proven management skills and experience in projects of similar scope and character to that envisioned in these terms of reference

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

TOTAL WEIGHTING = 20	MAX Value	INTERPRETATION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND QUALITY OF THE METHODOLOGY AND PROJECT PLAN PRESENTED
Work breakdown structure Weighting = 10	10	An excellent and detailed work breakdown structure provided indicating tasks, resources allocated and timeframes applicable
	5	An acceptable work breakdown structure is provided but does not indicate all tasks, resources allocated and timeframes applicable
	2	A poor work breakdown structure is provided and does not indicate all tasks, resources allocated and timeframes applicable
	0	No work breakdown structure is provided
Schedule of team members weighting= 5	5	Detailed schedule of all team members provided
	2	An acceptable schedule of team members is provided but does not provide enough detail
	0	No schedule of team members is provided
Breakdown of budget weighting = 5	5	An excellent and detailed breakdown of budget and cash flow / payment schedule provided that corresponds with the IDP timeline
	2	An acceptable breakdown of budget and/or cash flow / payment schedule provided
	0	No breakdown of budget and no cash flow / payment schedule indicated

## 2. References

The Bidder is hereby requested to provide a minimum of **3 contactable references**. The referees must complete, score and sign Form A. The original completed Form A is to be included in the tender documentation. Points for References will be allocated as indicated in the tables below and no points will be allocated in respect of incomplete or incorrect forms. Please note that the information provided will be verified by the Municipality. **The completed form A document, included in this document, is the only document which will be accepted for the bidder to score points.**

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

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

<b>COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME</b>		<b>(1 POINT)</b>
<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
<b>Timely submission of all reports when required?</b>	<b>Excellent (1Point)</b>	
	<b>Poor (0 Points)</b>	

<b>QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS</b>		<b>(5 POINTS)</b>
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
<b>What was the quality of the consultations and workmanship?</b>	<b>Excellent (5 Points)</b>	
	<b>Good (3 Points)</b>	
	<b>Fair (2 Point)</b>	
	<b>Poor (1 Points)</b>	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (2 Points)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (1 POINT)	
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?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (1 POINT)	
PROFESSIONALISM	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (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

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

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

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

<b>COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME</b>		<b>(1 POINT)</b>
<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
<b>Timely submission of all reports when required?</b>	<b>Excellent (1Point)</b>	
	<b>Poor (0 Points)</b>	

<b>QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS</b>		<b>(5 POINTS)</b>
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	
<b>What was the quality of the consultations and workmanship?</b>	<b>Excellent (5 Points)</b>	
	<b>Good (3 Points)</b>	
	<b>Fair (2 Point)</b>	
	<b>Poor (1 Points)</b>	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (2 Points)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (1 POINT)	
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?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (1 POINT)	
PROFESSIONALISM	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (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

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

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

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

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS ON TIME (1 POINT)	
<b>Question:</b>	<b>Answer</b>
Timely submission of all reports when required?	Excellent (1Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS (5 POINTS)	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
What was the quality of the consultations and workmanship?	Excellent (5 Points)
	Good (3 Points)
	Fair (2 Point)
	Poor (1 Points)

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET (2 POINTS)	
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (2 Points)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT (1 POINT)	
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?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS ON PROGRESS REPORTING (1 POINT)	
PROFESSIONALISM	
Question	Answer
Professional behaviour at all times, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (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

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....

**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: .....

Initials of Service Provider's Authority: .....