#### PART C3.2: FUNCTIONALITY EVALUATION CRITERION

## C3.2.1 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.

	POINTS
RITERIA  1. Experience - Company profile to be provided which consists of the following:	
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	30
2. References of the Company	30
3. Locality	40
Total	100

#### Criteria will be evaluated as follow:

## 1. Experience (Company Profile to be provide as stated above)

l.	Experience	Points
	a. More than 15 years	30
	b. More than 10 years – 15 years	24
	c. More than 8years – 10 years	18
	d. More than 4 years – 8 years	12
	e. 2 years – 4 years	6
	f. No Experience	0
	Total	

#### 2. References

The Bidder is hereby requested to provide a minimum of **3 contactable references**. The referees should 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.

Points will be allocated as per points allocation per question.

# FORM A 1: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER

## Referee No.1:

## **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 (3)	
Question:	Answer
Timely completion of the infrastructure, as required?	Excellent (3 Points)
	Good (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS	ITY OF ABOVE REPORTS (3 POINTS)	
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Excellent (3 Points)	
	Good (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET	
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT	(3 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?	Excellent (3 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.		
Signature of Deponent	Date of declaration	

# FORM A 2: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER

## Referee No.2:

# **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	(3 POINTS)
Question:	Answer
	Excellent (3 Points)
Timely completion of the infrastructure, as required?	Good (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS (3 POIN	
Question	Answer
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Excellent (3 Points)
	Good (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET	(1 POINTS)
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT	(3 POINTS)	
Question	Answer	
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution	Excellent (3 Points)	
Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were	Good (1 Point)	
created during the Project Initiation Stage?	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

# FORM A 3: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER

## Referee No.3:

# **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	(3 POINTS)
Question:	Answer
	Excellent (3 Points)
Timely completion of the infrastructure, as required?	Good (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS	(3 POINTS)
Question	Answer
	Excellent (3 Points)
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET	(1 POINTS)
Question	Answer
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)
	Poor (0 Points)

QUALITY OF END PRODUCT	(3 POINTS)
Question	Answer
Was work executed in accordance with the Project Execution	Excellent (3 Points)
Statement and did the final product match the expectations that were	Good (1 Point)
created during the Project Initiation Stage?	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	

## 2. References

2.	Refere	Points	
	a.	Total Points Scored by all three Referees (Min 30 points)	30
	b.	Total Points Scored by all three Referees (Min 18 points)	20
	C.	Total Points scored by all three Referees (Min 12 points)	10
	d.	Total Points scored by all three Referees (Less than 12 points)	0
	Total		

## 3. Locality

3.	Locality		Points
	a.	Hessequa Municipal Area	40
	b.	Garden Route	20
	C.	Western Cape Province	15
	d.	Other	5
	Total		

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.

#### PROPOSED KEY PERSONNEL

The Tenderer shall list below the key personnel (including first nominee and the second choice alternate), whom he proposes to employ on the project should his Tender be accepted, both at his headquarters and on the Site, to direct and for the execution of the work, together with their qualifications, experience, positions held and their nationalities. Refer to Conditions of Tender, Part C 1.2. for the minimum listing of suitable staff required. For the listed Key Staff in the Conditions of Tender, attach the following in this schedule:

- 1. CVs:
- 2. Qualifications (GreenCard, relevant degree/s, certificates, etc only relevant documentation);
- 3. ECSA registration if applicable;
- 4. Complete list of previous completed relevant projects (including values, date of completion, customer name, contact person and contact detail), together with a sworn affidavit that the information is correct.

DESIGNATION	NAME OF		<b>SUMMARY OF</b>			HDI
	NOMINEE / ALTERNATE	NATIONALI	QUALIFICAT- IONS AND NQF STATUS	EXPERIENCE OCCUPATION	AND PRESENT	Status Yes/No
Project manager, permanently based in South Africa						
ECSA registered Structural Engineer to design support structures for PV installation.						
Engineer or Technician with Solar Green Card qualification or equivalent						
Construction Monitoring Engineer on Site						
Other key staff (give designation)						

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

Failure to provide the information as stated above, may 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: