

SECTION 2.2: FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA

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	WEIGHT	VALUE	SCORE		
1. References	30				
2. Methodology	20				
3. Plant and equipment	20				
4. Experience of Tenderer (Compony profile to be provided)	30				
Total	100				
<p>2. Methodology</p> <p>Tenderers must submit a detailed methodology, describing how they . intent to carry out the described services. This methodology statement must, inter alia, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An estimate of the quantities of co-mingled recyclables he expects to receive in the Hessequa region and a plan to extend the throughput of the recyclable waste from the Hessequa people. • Provisional Operating Plan and daily operating schedule programme. • Methodology for recovery of materials and grades of materials to be recovered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Procedures for measuring, recording and reporting quantities of recyclables received, resourced and disposed of as tailings. (ii) Contingency Plan to deal with plant breakdowns, backlogs and an unexpected increase in recyclable quantity. • Details of any sub-contractors proposed to be used, including services that they will provide. • Strategy for marketing and disposing of the recyclable materials received. • Awareness programmes: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">None (Score 0)</td> <td>No methodology</td> </tr> </table>	None (Score 0)	No methodology	20		
None (Score 0)	No methodology				

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Poor (Score 5)</td> <td>Poor methodology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory (Score 10)</td> <td>Satisfactory methodology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (Score 15)</td> <td>Good methodology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very good (Score 20)</td> <td>Very good methodology</td> </tr> </table>	Poor (Score 5)	Poor methodology	Satisfactory (Score 10)	Satisfactory methodology	Good (Score 15)	Good methodology	Very good (Score 20)	Very good methodology											
Poor (Score 5)	Poor methodology																			
Satisfactory (Score 10)	Satisfactory methodology																			
Good (Score 15)	Good methodology																			
Very good (Score 20)	Very good methodology																			
<p>3. Plant and Equipment:</p> <p>The availability of Plant and Equipment required for the renting of the services as well as the Tenderers capability to provide sufficient standby Plant and Equipment during times of break downs which be evaluated.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>None (Score 0)</td> <td>The tenderer did not provide any data</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor (Score 5)</td> <td>Tenderer has limited appropriate plant and equipment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory (Score 10)</td> <td>Tenderer has relevant appropriate plant and equipment back without back-up</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (Score 15)</td> <td>Tenderer has extensive appropriate plant and equipment with sufficient back-up</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very good (Score 20)</td> <td>Tender has outstanding appropriate plant and equipment with an abundance of back-up</td> </tr> </table>		None (Score 0)	The tenderer did not provide any data	Poor (Score 5)	Tenderer has limited appropriate plant and equipment	Satisfactory (Score 10)	Tenderer has relevant appropriate plant and equipment back without back-up	Good (Score 15)	Tenderer has extensive appropriate plant and equipment with sufficient back-up	Very good (Score 20)	Tender has outstanding appropriate plant and equipment with an abundance of back-up	20								
None (Score 0)	The tenderer did not provide any data																			
Poor (Score 5)	Tenderer has limited appropriate plant and equipment																			
Satisfactory (Score 10)	Tenderer has relevant appropriate plant and equipment back without back-up																			
Good (Score 15)	Tenderer has extensive appropriate plant and equipment with sufficient back-up																			
Very good (Score 20)	Tender has outstanding appropriate plant and equipment with an abundance of back-up																			
<p>4. Experience of Tenderer</p> <p>The experience of the Tenderer as apposed to the key staff members / experts in similar projects or similar areas and conditions in relating to the scope of work will be evaluated.</p> <p>Tenderer should very briefly describe his or her experience in this regard and attached this to the schedule.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Employer, contact person and telephone number</th> <th>Description of work (service)</th> <th>Value of work (i.e. the service provided) inclusive of VAT (Rand)</th> <th>Date completed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Employer, contact person and telephone number	Description of work (service)	Value of work (i.e. the service provided) inclusive of VAT (Rand)	Date completed													30		
Employer, contact person and telephone number	Description of work (service)	Value of work (i.e. the service provided) inclusive of VAT (Rand)	Date completed																	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>None (Score 0)</td> <td>No info provided</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor (Score 5)</td> <td>Tenderer has limited experience (< 1 year)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory (Score 10)</td> <td>Tender has relevant experience, but has not dealt with the critical issues specific to the assignment (1-3 years)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (Score 15)</td> <td>Tenderer has extensive experience in relation to the project and has worked previously under similar conditions and circumstances (more than 3-5 years)</td> </tr> </table>		None (Score 0)	No info provided	Poor (Score 5)	Tenderer has limited experience (< 1 year)	Satisfactory (Score 10)	Tender has relevant experience, but has not dealt with the critical issues specific to the assignment (1-3 years)	Good (Score 15)	Tenderer has extensive experience in relation to the project and has worked previously under similar conditions and circumstances (more than 3-5 years)											
None (Score 0)	No info provided																			
Poor (Score 5)	Tenderer has limited experience (< 1 year)																			
Satisfactory (Score 10)	Tender has relevant experience, but has not dealt with the critical issues specific to the assignment (1-3 years)																			
Good (Score 15)	Tenderer has extensive experience in relation to the project and has worked previously under similar conditions and circumstances (more than 3-5 years)																			

Very good (Score 20)	Tenderer as outstanding experience in projects of a similar nature (> 5 years)			
Total		100 (a)		(So)

REFERENCES:

The Bidder is hereby requested to provide a minimum of **5 contactable references**. The references must complete, score and sign **Form A: Original Completed Form A** to be included in the tender documentation. Points for References will be allocated as indicated in the tables below. 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.**

Points will be allocated as per points allocation per question.

FORM A: NOMINATED REFERENCES FOR BIDDER

Background information of Nominated Referees

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referees:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

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

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (2 Points)	
	Fair (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	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 always, 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

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referees:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

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

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (2 Points)	
	Fair (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	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 always, 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

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referees:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

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

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (2 Points)	
	Fair (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	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 always, 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

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referees:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

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

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (2 Points)	
	Fair (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	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 always, towards Client and all Role Players?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Additional Remarks/Comments:

<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

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

Referee name:	
Postal address	
Contact number of referees:	
Email address:	
Name of Bidder evaluated:	
Project Name:	
Project Description:	
Project Completion date:	
Project duration:	
Final Project Cost:	

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

QUALITY OF ABOVE REPORTS		(2 POINTS)
Question	Answer	
What was the quality of the workmanship?	Good (2 Points)	
	Fair (1 Point)	
	Poor (0 Points)	

Initials of Service Provider's Authority:

COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENTS WITHIN BUDGET		(1 POINT)
Question	Answer	
Did the bidder complete the project within the allocated Budget?	Excellent (1 Point)	
	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 always, 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:

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: