

Ref No:	740	0.45.3_evaluation_c	Page 1 of 7			
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICES**

Flavius Mareka TVET College
Embrace your Future

Bidder name:	Vendor Number

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SERVICES**

- 1. THE BID WILL BE EVALUATED AS FOLLOWS:
- 1.1 Assessment on Functionality (separate from price): 128 points in total, converted to a total weight of 100
- 1.2 Assessment on price: 80 points
- 1.3 B-BBEE grading: 20 points
- 2. THE VALUE OF THIS BID IS ESTIMATED NOT TO EXCEED R50 MILLION AND THEREFORE THE 80/20 SYSTEM SHALL BE APPLICABLE.
- 3. PRE-QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS/FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA
- 3.1 All bids will be subject to Pre-Qualification and will be required to achieve a minimum of 60 percent (%) for functionality to be further evaluated.
- 3.2 Bidders who score below the minimum requirement in the assessment of functionality will not be considered.
- 3.3 All the necessary documentation must be submitted for the Evaluation Panel to make an informed evaluation. Evaluation of the Technical (Quality) Requirements will be based on the information provided by the bidder.

No.	Criteria	Points	Weight
C1	Experience	60	30
C2	Capability + Capacity	26	40
C3	Qualifications	12	
C4	Financial Viability	10	10
C5	Locally Based	20	20
	GRAND TOTAL	128	100

3.4 Bidders that score the minimum percentage or more will qualify to be evaluated in terms of the 80/20 preference points system where 80 points must be used for price and 20 points for B-BBEEE scores.

	Page 1 of 7					
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020

Document number	Evaluation criteria for	Page 2 of 7	Issue	
740.45.2	services		2	

Bidder name : _	Vendor Number

C1		FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY - EXPERIENCE Previous successfully carried out projects, supplier's history (similar projects only)									
	Criteria Possible Documentary proof in points order to claim points				ice use or	POINTS ALLOC oly – circle the po		fill in the total)			
C1.1	Relevant history of	< 3 yrs	2	Proof of registration for e.g. close corporation	Evidence Proof of company	Points	Evidence Proof of company	Points	Evidence Proof of	Points	
	company:	3 - 6 yrs	4	J T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	registered less than 3 vrs	2	registered 3 – 6	4	company registered 6+	6	
	(Maximum of 6 points)	6+ yrs	6		уго		yrs	7	yrs		
					Total		Total		Total		

	740.45.3_evaluation_criteria_for_services						
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020	

Document number	Evaluation criteria for	Page 3 of 7	Issue	
740.45.2	services		2	

Bidder name :	Vendor Number

C1	FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY - EXPERIENCE Previous successfully carried out projects, supplier's history (similar projects only)											
		Criteria	Possibl e points	Documentary claim points	Documentary proof in order to							
C.1.2 Reference letters: (Maximum of		1 Letter	8		Letters from referees regarding SIMILAR service delivered. Letters should contain/display the following:				Evidence Contents in letter to be checked:	Letter 1	Letter 2	Letter 3
	24 points)	2 Letters	16	o not be older	than 3 mont	hs			Letter not older than 3 months	1	1	1
		3 Letters	24					Letter on official letterhead	1	1	1	
			services were rendered  o clear contact details so that the reference could				Clear contact details that could be followed up	1	1	1		
				be followed ι	ир				Description/details of project/services	1	1	1
	<ul> <li>description/details of projects/services rendered</li> <li>time frame when project was carried out</li> <li>value of contract</li> <li>quality of services rendered must be clear</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>time frame when project was carried out</li> <li>value of contract</li> <li>quality of services rendered must be clear</li> </ul>	ered	Time frame of project with confirmation that project was delivered within agreed time	1	1	1				
				o letter must b	letter must be legally certified				Value of contract	1	1	1
						Quality of services rendered	1	1	1			
				TAKE NOTE				Letter legally certified	1	1	1	
				References in table supporting evidence LETTERS WILL B	ce. ONLY I	NFORM			Total			

	740.45.3_evaluation_criteria_for_services Page 3 of 7				Page 3 of 7	
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020

Document number	Evaluation criteria for	Page 4 of 7	Issue	
740.45.2	services		2	

Bidder name :	Vendor Number
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

C1	FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY - EXPERIENCE  Previous successfully carried out projects, supplier's history (similar projects only)							
		Criteria	Possible points	Documentary proof in order to claim points	(For		S ALLOCATED rcle the points and fill	in the total)
C1.3	(Maxi mum of 30 points)	Experience of medical team	30	<ul> <li>Curriculum vitae of team reflecting experience in ANY the following:</li> <li>Occupational Health Practitioner</li> <li>Occupational Medical Practitioner</li> <li>Registered Nurse (in Occupational</li> </ul>	S yr 5 - 10 yr 10+ - 15 yr 15+ - 20 yr 20+ yr	CV ref Team member 1  1 3 5 8 10	recting experience Team member 2  1 3 5 8 10  Total	Team member 3  1 3 5 8 10

	740.45.3_evaluation_criteria_for_services					Page 4 of 7
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020

Document number	Evaluation criteria for	Page 5 of 7	Issue	
740.45.2	services		2	

Bidder name :	Vendor Number
	<del></del>

C2	FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY – CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY								
		Criteria	Possibl e points	Documentary proof in order to claim points	POINTS ALLOCATED (For office use only – circle the points and fill	in the total)			
	(Maximum of	Proof of capability	10	Proof that the company has access to		Points			
	26 points)	to deliver		mobile units and will come to the college	Certified affidavit, not older than 3 months	2			
	, ,			if necessary	stating that the company has access to mobile units and will come to the college if necessary	2			
				<ul> <li>Confirmation of the biggest group to test/assess</li> <li>Confirmation of smallest group to</li> </ul>	Certified affidavit, not older than 3 months, stating the biggest group of students that can be assessed at the same time	3			
				test/assess  TAKE NOTE – IF COPIES ARE NOT CERTIFIED, NO POINTS WILL BE ALLOCATED	Certified affidavit, not older than 3 months, stating the least number of students that can be assessed at a time	3			
		Timely delivery	8	Indication of how long in advance a purchase order must be issued	Certified affidavit, not older than 3 months, indicating the acceptable amount of time before medical testing can be done after receipt of an official purchase order	4			
				Issuing of certificates	Certified affidavit, not older than 3 months, confirming that student certificates will be issued to the college on completion of the medical assessment	4			
		Registration with relevant accrediting body	8	Copy of relevant CSD registration (FULL REPORT, not just a summary)	Registration at Central Supplier Database for Government (FULL REPORT, not just a summary	8			
				) *	TOTAL				

	74	0.45.3_evaluation_c	riteria_for_servic	es		Page 5 of 7
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020

Document numb	per Evaluation criteria for	Page 6 of 7	Issue	
740.45.2	services		2	

Bidder name :	Vendor Number
Diddel Hairie .	 vendor number

	Criteria	Possible	Documentary proof in	POINTS ALLOCATED	
		points	order to	(For office use only – circle the points and fill i	n the total)
		-	claim points		
(Maxi	Relevant qualifications	6	<ul> <li>Certified copy of</li> </ul>	Evidence	Points
mum			relevant qualification	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT qualification	2
of 12			in ANY of the	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT qualification	2
points)			following:	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT qualification	
			Ossumational		
			<ul> <li>Occupational</li> <li>Health Practitioner</li> </ul>		
			Occupational		2
			Medical Practitioner		2
			<ul> <li>Registered Nurse</li> </ul>	('()	
			(in Occupational		
			Health)		
	Registration with	6	<ul> <li>Certified copy of</li> </ul>	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT registration	2
	relevant accrediting		certification and/or	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT registration	2
	body		relevant registration	Certified copy, not older than 3 months, of RELEVANT registration	
	-		with any of the		
			following:		
			<ul> <li>Professional</li> <li>Council of South</li> </ul>		2
			Africa (HPCSA)		
			o ISO 9001		
			3 100 0001	TOTAL	

=								
	74	Page 6 of 7						
Approved by:	Council	Issue Date:	12/03/2015	Rev:	3	16/07/2020		

Document number	Evaluation criteria for	Page 7 of 7	Issue
740.45.2	services		2

Bidder name : Vendor Nu	mber
-------------------------	------

C4				PROOF OF FINANC	CIAL VIABILITY	TO DELIVE	R THE SER	VICE		
		Criteria	Possible points	Documentary claim points	proof	in	order	<b>3</b>	POINTS ALLO (For office use only points and fill in	- circle the
	(Maximum of 10 points)	Financial analysis of business viability	10	Or  Review of Financial (or relevant person)	Documents do			untant	Latest financial statements Or Letter from accredited accountant	10

C5				LOCALITY			
		Criteria	Possible points	Documentary proof in order to claim points	POINTS ALLOCATED (For office use only – circle the points and fi in the total)		
	(Maximum of 20 points)	Proof of business/office locally based	20	Municipal account (water and electricity) of the bidder's premises. Information will be vetted     Or	Business located within a radius of 80 km of Sasolburg OR Kroonstad	20	
			(	<ul> <li>In cases where the premises are hired an original letter/ lease agreement from the owner certifying that you are hiring the premises must be submitted with the bid document.</li> </ul>	Business located within a radius of 100 km of Sasolburg OR Kroonstad	10	
				TAKE NOTE: Information provided will be vetted.	Total		

	74	Page 7 of 7	
Approved by:	Council Issue Date: 12/03/2015 Rev: 3		16/07/2020