

## ANNEXURE B

### Technical evaluation criteria

#### 1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

##### 1.1 Phase 1: Mandatory evaluation

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

Mandatory Requirement	Comply	Not Comply
The bidder must be a partner or reseller to supply, implement and support Mimecast products required.  <b>Note:</b> The bidder must attach as part of this proposal proof from the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) that the bidder is a partner or reseller of Mimecast products		
<b>Substantiate/ Comments</b>		

## 1.2 Phase 2: Technical evaluation

Bidders will be evaluated according to the below technical evaluation criteria. Minimum Technical Threshold 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.

### 1.2.1 EXPERIENCE OF THE COMPANY

The bidder must have relevant experience in implementing and supporting email archiving solution.

**Bidder must provide letters signed by their clients on client's letter head and include the company name and contactable details (such as telephone number or email address) and it should indicate details of the services rendered.**

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
5 Reference letters and more	Signed Reference letters	5	20%
4 Reference letters		4	
3 Reference letters		3	
2 Reference letters		2	
1 Reference letter		1	
No Reference letter provided		0	

### 1.2.2 EXPERIENCE OF THE SUPPORT TEAM

The team that will be managing and supporting the solution must have experience in supporting Mimecast email archiving solution.

**Bidder must provide CVs for the support team detailing the relevant years of experience in supporting and maintaining the Mimecast email archiving solution.**

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
> 8 years of experience	CVs of the team clearly listing client's names and work done and years'	5	20%
8 years of experience		4	
> 5 years of experience but < 8 years of experience		3	
5 years of experience		2	

> 3 years of experience but < 5 years of experience	experience of each team member	2	
3 years of experience		1	
<3 years of experience		0	

### 1.2.3 SOLUTION MUST BE ABLE TO MEET THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS

- Email security
- Email archiving and retention
- Large files send
- Secure messaging
- Business continuity / remote access
- Services- Business Support Silver
- Email signature management

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
Bidder's solution meets all 7 or more of the listed email archiving requirements	Proposal	5	30%
Bidder's solution meets 6 of the listed email archiving requirements		4	
Bidder's solution meets 5 of the listed email archiving requirements		3	
Bidder's solution meets 4 of the listed email archiving requirements		2	
Bidder's solution meets 3 of the listed email archiving requirements		1	
Bidder's solution meets < 3 of the listed email archiving requirements		0	

### 1.2.4 SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT

a) Turnaround times when system is down

**Bidder must submit a detailed SLA document highlighting the following:**

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
Resolution time in <2 hours	detailed SLA document	5	10%
Resolution time in 2 hours		3	
Resolution time in >2 hours		1	
No resolution time stated		0	

b) Turnaround times when the system is still functioning, but some users are experiencing problems

**Bidder must submit a detailed SLA document highlighting the following:**

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
Resolution time in <8 hours	detailed SLA document	5	10%
Resolution time in 8 hours		3	
Resolution time in >8 hours		1	
No resolution time stated		0	

c) Turnaround times when requested to Implement changes requested by CEF

**Bidder must submit a detailed SLA document highlighting the following:**

Evaluation Criteria	Document as Evidence	Score	Weighting %
Resolution time in <3 days	detailed SLA document	5	10%
Resolution time in 3 days		3	
Resolution time in >3 days		1	
No resolution time stated		0	

### 1.3 Phase 3: Commercial evaluation (Based on Price and Specific goals)

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

a) Preference points/specific goals criteria

b) [Weighted score 20 points]

c) Specific goals / Preference Points Claim

Evaluation Criteria	Final Weighted Scores
Price	80
Specific goals	20
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Specific goals	Points
<b>Historically disadvantaged individual (HDI)</b>	
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>

**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.