

Issued: 3 April 2018

Response Submission Date: 11 May 2018

TENDER NO: DHA06-2018

The Republic of South Africa

Department of Home Affairs

**REQUEST FOR PRE-QUALIFICATION FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF SIX (6)
PORTS OF ENTRY THROUGH A PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP**

PART C: SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES



home affairs

Department:
Home Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

LIST OF DOCUMENTS COMPRISING THE RFQ

No.	Document	Description
<u>PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION, REQUIREMENTS AND RULES</u>		
1.	<u>Part A – Volume 1</u>	<u>Project Information</u>
	Part A – Volume 1: Schedule A	Treasury Approval I
<u>PART B: QUALIFICATION CRITERIA AND RESPONSE FORMS</u>		
2.	<u>Part B – Volume 1</u>	<u>Qualification Criteria</u>
3.	<u>Part B – Volume 2</u>	<u>Response Forms</u>
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule A	Form of Response
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule B	Declaration of Respondent
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule C	Letter of Intent
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule D	Confidentiality Undertaking
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule E	Declaration of Interest Litigation and Past Supply Chain Practises Form
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule F	SBD 4 – Declaration of Interest
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule G	SBD 8 – Respondent’s Past Supply Chain Management Practices
	Part B – Volume 2: Schedule H	SBD 9 – Certificate of Independent Bid Determination

PART C: SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	THE PURPOSE OF THIS PART C (<i>SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES</i>)	4
2.	TECHNICAL DELIVERABILITY CRITERIA	5
3.	BROADBAND CONNECTIVITY CRITERIA.....	9
4.	FINANCIAL CRITERIA.....	11
5.	PROJECT AWARENESS.....	13
6.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA	15
7.	SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES	17

PART C: SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PART C (SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES)

1.1 This Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*) of the RFQ contains the requirements for the detailed Response and the evaluation methods, criteria and weighting in respect of those parts of the Response that are subject to evaluation in terms of this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*). Those parts are:

1.1.1 Technical Criteria;

1.1.2 Broadband Connectivity Criteria;

1.1.3 Financial Criteria;

1.1.4 Project Awareness; and

1.1.5 Economic Development.

1.2 The Department will only consider a Response submitted by a Respondent in terms of this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*) if that Respondent fulfils all of the requirements of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*) of the RFQ to the Department's satisfaction.

1.3 The Respondent must respond to each and every heading in this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*) and in the appendices referred to in this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*), and provide comprehensive responses and information in respect of each heading. Failure by a Respondent to respond adequately to any of the headings of this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*) and the appendices referred to in this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*), shall have an adverse impact on the evaluation of its Response and shall entitle the Department, in its sole discretion, to disregard that Respondent's Response and to disqualify that Respondent from the evaluation and any further participation in the procurement process of this Project.

1.4 The evaluation in terms of this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*) will be undertaken in accordance with the following point system:

- 1.4.1 Technical Deliverability Criteria – thirty two (32) points;
- 1.4.2 Broadband Connectivity Criteria – three (3) points
- 1.4.3 Financial Criteria – thirty five (35) points;
- 1.4.4 Project Awareness – fifteen (15) points; and
- 1.4.5 Economic Development Criteria – fifteen (15) points.

2. TECHNICAL DELIVERABILITY CRITERIA

- 2.1 In order for a Respondent to comply with the Technical Deliverability Criteria, a minimum of seventy percent (70%) is required to be achieved by a Respondent. Each Technical Deliverability Criterion is individually scored out of a total of one hundred (100) points based on its underlying sub-criteria.
- 2.2 The individual Technical Deliverability Criterion scores will be weighted in order to arrive at a total score of three hundred (300) for Technical Deliverability Criteria.
- 2.3 The three (3) Technical Deliverability Criterion will be weighted as follows:
 - 2.3.1 Technical Deliverability Criterion 1: Technical Approach and Understanding – twenty percent (20%);
 - 2.3.2 Technical Deliverability Criterion 2: Technical Experience – forty percent (40%); and
 - 2.3.3 Technical Deliverability Criterion 3: Technical Team - forty percent (40%).
- 2.4 The table below provides details on the scoring of each of the criteria and the requirements as outlined in Volume 1 (*Qualification Criteria*) of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*).

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
1	Technical Deliverability Criterion 1: Technical Approach and Understanding.	100	20%
1.1	The Respondent has provided relevant information and discussion	25	5.0%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
1	Technical Deliverability Criterion 1: Technical Approach and Understanding.	100	20%
	on the staged design approach, construction and constructability as well as operations and maintenance of the infrastructure.		
1.2	<p>The Respondent has provided information on how they will deal with the risks associated with the locations, logistics and other complexities of the Project.</p> <p>The Respondent has discussed the complexities of maintaining the Port of Entry operations during construction as well as any potential phased approach required. – fifteen (15) points</p> <p>The Respondent has discussed the complexities of multiple teams across multiple sites and the logistics thereof. – fifteen (15) points</p> <p>The Respondent has included a risk statement highlighting potential major risks associated with the technical requirements of this particular Project – twenty (20) points.</p>	50	10.0%
1.3	The Respondent has provided information that talks to the relevant SANS and other requirements for the services during the phases and sites of the project. This includes service specific lists of major SANS compliance.	25	5.0%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
2	Technical Deliverability Criterion 2: Technical Experience	100	40%
2.1	Summary Project Table submitted		
	Summary Project Table submitted with all relevant information – twenty (20) points Summary Project Table submitted	20	8%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
2	Technical Deliverability Criterion 2: Technical Experience	100	40%
	with information missing – fifteen (15) points No Summary Table Submitted – zero (0) points		
2.2	Applicable project sheets submitted for comparable projects completed in the last ten (10) years. 1 comparable project: - forty (40) points 2 comparable projects: - fifty (50) points 3 comparable projects: - sixty (60) points 4 comparable projects: - seventy (70) points 5 comparable projects: - eighty (80) points	80	32.0%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
3	Technical Deliverability Criterion 3: Technical Team	100	40%
3.1	Main organogram provided showing overall project management structure and how each team member is placed within the structure. Compliance showing team with correct names and designation with reference to the CVs. – ten (10) points Non-compliant – zero (0) points	10	4.0%
3.2	All sub-organograms submitted Compliance showing correct service line manager as per main organogram as well as defined structure below the manager - ten (10) points Non-compliant – zero (0) points	10	4.0%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
3	Technical Deliverability Criterion 3: Technical Team	100	40%
3.3	<p>Acceptable CV submitted for the following roles as well as per the organogram. Please ensure that the CV's contain evidence of the minimum experience and certification that is required as set out in Volume 1 of Part B (<i>Qualification Criteria and Response Forms</i>)</p> <p>The number after each designation is the points allocated for a correctly submitted and compliant CV. In the event that the CV does not comply with the requirements set out in Volume 1 and Volume 2 of Part B (<i>Qualification Criteria and Response Forms</i>), the CV will be allocated zero (0) points.</p> <p>Lead Project Manager – seven (7) points Lead Project QS five (5) points Project Design Manager - four (4) points Design Manager - Architecture – two (2) points Design Manager - Structural - two (2) points Design Manager – Mechanical - two (2) points Design Manager – Electrical - two (2) points Design Manager - Electronic - two (2) points Design Manager - Civil – two (2) points Design Manager – Town Planning – two (2) points Environmental Manager – Environmental Services – four (4) points Project Construction Manager – five (5) points Construction Manager - Architecture - three (3) points</p>	80	32.0%

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
3	Technical Deliverability Criterion 3: Technical Team	100	40%
	Construction Manager - Structural - three (3) points Construction Manager - Mechanical - three (3) points Construction Manager – Electrical - three (3) points Construction Manager - Electronic - three (3) points Construction Manager - Civil - three (3) points Project Maintenance Manager – six (6) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 1 - three (3) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 2 - three (3) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 3 - three (3) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 4 - three (3) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 5 - three (3) points Lead Maintenance Manager Site 6 - three (3) points		

REF	TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
		300	100%
1.	Technical Deliverability Criterion 1: Technical Approach and Understanding	100	20%
2.	Technical Deliverability Criterion 2: Technical Experience	100	40%
3.	Technical Deliverability Criterion 3: Technical Team	100	40%

3. BROADBAND CONNECTIVITY CRITERIA

3.1 The table below provides details on the scoring of each of the Broadband Connectivity Criteria and the requirements as outlined in Volume 1 (*Qualification Criteria*) of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*).

REF	BROADBAND CONNECTIVITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
1	Broadband Connectivity Criterion 1: Technical Experience	100	67%
1.1	Summary Project Table submitted	20	
	Summary Project Table submitted with all relevant information – twenty (20) points Summary Project Table submitted with information missing – fifteen (15) points No Summary Table Submitted – zero (0) points		
1.2	Applicable project sheets submitted for comparable projects completed in the last ten (10) years. 1 comparable project: - forty (40) points 2 comparable projects: - fifty (50) points 3 comparable projects: - sixty (60) points 4 comparable projects: - seventy (70) points 5 comparable projects: - eighty (80) points	80	
REF	BROADBAND CONNECTIVITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
2	Broadband Connectivity Criterion 2: Technical Team	50	33%
2.1	Main organogram provided showing overall project management structure and how each team member is placed within the structure. Compliance showing team with correct names and designation with reference to the CVs. – five (5) points Non-compliant – zero (0) points	5	
2.2	All sub-organograms submitted Compliance showing correct service line manager as per main organogram as well as defined structure below the manager - five (5) points Non-compliant– zero (0) points	5	

REF	BROADBAND CONNECTIVITY CRITERIA	POINTS	OVERALL WEIGHTING
1	Broadband Connectivity Criterion 1: Technical Experience	100	67%
2.3	Acceptable CV submitted for the Broadband Connectivity roles as indicated per the organogram.	40	

4. FINANCIAL CRITERIA

4.1 Each of the Financial Qualification Criteria contained in Volume 1 (*Qualification Criteria*) of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*) will be scored in accordance with the matrix in clause 4.2 below.

4.2 The four (4) Financial Qualification Criteria will carry the following weightings:

4.2.1 Financial Criterion 1: Financial Standing of the Respondent as demonstrated by financial reporting information – twenty five percent (25%);

4.2.2 Financial Criterion 2: Financial Standing of the Guarantor as demonstrated by financial reporting information – twenty five percent (25%);

4.2.3 Financial Criterion 3: History of completing and raising capital (Debt and Equity) for similar transactions – twenty five percent (25%);

4.2.4 Financial Criterion 4: Other commitments in the foreseeable future – twenty five percent (25%).

4.3 The minimum requirement for qualification is an overall adequate rating i.e. seventy five percent (75%)

4.4 Scoring Matrix in respect of Financial Qualification Criteria:

SCORE	EVALUATION
Poor (twenty five percent (25%))	Financial Criterion 1: The response does not appropriately demonstrate that the Respondent has the financial standing and ability to raise capital for the entire portion of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.

SCORE	EVALUATION
	<p>Financial Criterion 2: The response does not appropriately demonstrate that the Guarantor has the financial standing and ability to raise capital for the entire portion of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 3: The response does not demonstrate that the Respondent has a history of raising capital for at least 5 similar transactions.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 4: The response does not demonstrate that the Respondent has sufficient capacity to deliver on their responsibilities under the Project.</p>
Adequate (seventy five percent (75%))	<p>Financial Criterion 1: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has a satisfactory financial standing and ability to raise capital for the entire portion of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 2: The response demonstrates that the Guarantor has a satisfactory financial standing and ability to raise capital for the entire portion of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 3: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has a satisfactory history of raising capital for at least 5 similar transactions.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 4: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has satisfactory capacity to deliver on their responsibilities under the Project.</p>
Good (one hundred percent (100%))	<p>Financial Criterion 1: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has an unquestionable financial standing and ability to raise capital well in excess of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 2: The response demonstrates that the Guarantor has an unquestionable financial standing and ability to raise capital well in excess of the relevant capital requirements of the Project.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 3: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has an unquestionable history of successfully raising capital for at least 5 similar transactions.</p> <p>Financial Criterion 4: The response demonstrates that the Respondent has an unquestionable capacity to deliver on their responsibilities under the Project.</p>

5. PROJECT AWARENESS

5.1 In Volume 1 (*Qualification Criteria*) of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*), the evaluation in respect of Project Awareness comprises of the following:

- 5.1.1 Project Awareness: General;
- 5.1.2 Project Awareness: Understanding of Project Complexities;
- 5.1.3 Project Awareness: Public Private Partnerships; and
- 5.1.4 Project Awareness: Legal General Issues.

5.2 In this Part C (*Scoring and Ranking of Compliant Responses*), Respondents will only be evaluated and scored in respect of:

5.2.1 Project Awareness: Understanding of Project Complexities - for the Respondent's understanding of the Project complexities in relation to, but not limited to:

- 5.2.1.1 the opportunity to charge user fees for passing through at the Ports of Entry;
- 5.2.1.2 expertise in cross border goods transportation;
- 5.2.1.3 the goods clearance procedures at the Ports of Entry and what constitutes cross border goods clearance procedures; and
- 5.2.1.4 financial impact on inefficiencies at the Ports of Entry as a result of poor cross border goods clearance procedures.

5.2.2 Project Awareness Public Private Partnerships - for experience that the Respondent has had in PPP or comparable projects.

5.2.3 The points allocated for Project Awareness are as follows:

- 5.2.3.1 Project Awareness: Understanding of Project Complexities – five (5) points; and
- 5.2.3.2 Project Awareness: Public Private Partnerships – ten (10) points.

5.3 Project Awareness: Understanding of Project Complexities

Project Awareness: Understanding of Project Complexities will be evaluated as indicated in the below table.

PROJECT AWARENESS: UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT COMPLEXITIES	
SCORE	EVALUATION
(Zero (0) to twenty five percent (25%) Poor	<p>The Respondent has provided no understanding of the Project complexities.</p> <p>The Respondent has no information or inadequate information in relation to the understanding of the opportunity to charge user fees for passing through at the Ports of Entry, expertise in cross border goods transportation, the goods clearance procedures at the Ports of Entry and what constitutes cross border goods clearance procedures and the financial impact on inefficiencies at the Ports of Entry as a result of poor cross border goods clearance procedures.</p>
(Twenty six percent (26%) to forty nine percent (49%)) Below Adequate	<p>The Respondent has provided adequate understanding of the Project complexities.</p> <p>The Respondent has adequate information in relation to the understanding of the opportunity to charge user fees for passing through at the Ports of Entry, expertise in cross border goods transportation, the goods clearance procedures at the Ports of Entry and what constitutes cross border goods clearance procedures and the financial impact on inefficiencies at the Ports of Entry as a result of poor cross border goods clearance procedures.</p>
Fifty percent (50%) to seventy five percent (75%) Adequate	<p>The Respondent has provided sufficient understanding of the Project complexities.</p> <p>The Respondent has provided sufficient information in relation to the understanding of the opportunity to charge user fees for passing through at the Ports of Entry, expertise in cross border goods transportation, the goods clearance procedures at the Ports of Entry and what constitutes cross border goods clearance procedures and the financial impact on inefficiencies at the Ports of Entry as a result of poor cross border goods clearance procedures.</p>
Seventy six percent (76%) to one hundred percent (100%) Excellent	<p>The Respondent has provided a firm understanding of the Project complexities.</p> <p>The Respondent has provided a firm understanding and adequate information in relation to the understanding of the opportunity to charge user fees for passing through at the Ports of Entry, expertise in cross border goods transportation, the goods clearance procedures at the Ports of Entry and what constitutes cross border goods clearance procedures and the financial impact on inefficiencies at the Ports of Entry as a result of poor cross border goods clearance procedures.</p>

5.4 Project Awareness: Public Private Partnership

Project Awareness: Public Private Partnerships will be evaluated as indicated in the below table.

PROJECT AWARENESS: PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS	
SCORE	EVALUATION
(Zero (0) to twenty five percent (25%) Poor	The Respondent has no experience of previous PPP projects or comparable projects and the nature and extent of their involvement. The Respondent has no information or inadequate information of contact details of organisations for whom they have performed, or procured the performance of, comparable projects and whom the Department may approach for references.
(Twenty six percent (26%) to forty nine percent (49%) Below Adequate	The Respondent has provided one (1) example of previous PPP projects or comparable projects and the nature and extent of their involvement. The Respondent has provided adequate information of contact details of organisations for whom they have performed, or procured the performance of, comparable projects and whom the Department may approach for references.
Fifty percent (50%) to seventy five percent (75%) Adequate	The Respondent has provided two (2) examples of previous PPP projects or comparable projects and the nature and extent of their involvement. The Respondent has provided sufficient information of contact details of organisations for whom they have performed, or procured the performance of, comparable projects and whom the Department may approach for references.
Seventy six percent (76%) to one hundred percent (100%) Excellent	The Respondent has provided three (3) or more examples of previous PPP projects or comparable projects and the nature and extent of their involvement. The Respondent has provided sufficient information of contact details of organisations for whom they have performed, or procured the performance of, comparable projects and whom the Department may approach for references.

6. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

6.1 Economic Development will be scored as follows:

6.1.1 Contributor Status Level – ten (10) points; and

6.1.2 Track Record – five (5) points.

6.2 Contributor Status Level

6.2.1 The PPPFA Regulations (2017) provide in Regulation 4 for Pre-

qualification criteria for Economic Development. As indicated in section 7.1 of Volume 1 (*Qualification Criteria*) of Part B (*Qualification Criteria and Response Forms*) Respondents are required to have a minimum Contributor Status Level of four (4) in order to be evaluated further.

6.2.2 In the case of a Respondent which is a consortium or joint venture, the weighted value of the Respondent's Contributor Status Level will be determined with reference to the Amended B-BBEE Codes using the following formula:

$$A = \sum_{n=1}^N (B_n \times C_n) / D$$

Where:

A = Respondent's weighted average Member's Contributor Status Level;

B = Member's, n, percentage Shareholding in the Respondent;

C = the qualification score of the Member, n, as indicated in its B-BBEE Verification Certificate or if such Member does not have such a B-BBEE Verification Certificate, a deemed qualification score of zero;

D = total Member commitment, expressed as a percentage; and

N = total number of Members.

6.2.3 Respondents are required to have a minimum Contributor Status Level of four (4) in order to be evaluated. The following table will be used to calculate the points for Economic Development.

B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTOR	NUMBER OF POINTS
1	10
2	9
3	6
4	5

6.3 **Track Record**

6.3.1 Respondents will be evaluated and scored out of five (5) points for providing the experience of each Member in implementing plans and programmes in relation to:

6.3.1.1 Skills Development – one (1) point;

6.3.1.2 Preferential Procurement – two (2) points;

6.3.1.3 Enterprise Development - one (1) point; and

6.3.1.4 Socio-Economic Development - one (1) point.

6.3.2 It must be noted that it would be sufficient for a single Member to demonstrate experience in undertaking the programmes.

7. **SCORING AND RANKING OF COMPLIANT RESPONSES**

7.1 Each Respondent's points for Technical Deliverability Criteria, Broadband Connectivity Criteria, Financial Criteria, Project Awareness and Economic Development Criteria will be added to determine the total points (scored out of one hundred (100) points) earned in respect of a Compliant Response.

7.2 The decision to pre-qualify the Respondents as Pre-qualified Bidders will have regard to the overall scoring and ranking achieved by that Respondent. The Department will pre-qualify no more than five (5) Respondents.