# TERMS OF REFERNCE*:* REQUEST FOR QUOTE: GREEN STAR EXISITING BUILDING PERFORMANCE (EBP) GOVERNNMENT BUILDINGS RATING TOOL FOR AGRÉMENT SOUTH AFRICA AND GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL SOUTH AFRICA (GBCSA)

| | |
|---|---|
| **RFQ Number** | **RFQ NO. ASA 002/2020** |
| **Date of issue** | **13 May 2020** |
| **Bid Closing date** | **12 June 2020 at 16:30 pm** |
| **Submissions** | **procurement@agrement.co.za** |

**1. TECHNICAL ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:**

Zama Thusi

+27 12 842 7196

zthusi01@agrement.co.za

Salome Nwabueze

+27 12 841 3023

SNwabueze@agrement.co.za

**2. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:**

Tebogo Saudi

+27 12 841 2388

tsaudi@agrement.co.za

## 1. BACKGROUND

The Green Building Council South Africa (GBCSA) was established in September 2007, and the GBCSA's purpose is to establish a built environment in which people and planet can thrive. The GBCSA is a membership-based company that has three main functions: Advocacy, Training and Certification, and operates as a non-profit Section 21 company.

As a key instrument to assist in the pursuit of its purpose, the GBCSA uses green building rating tools that aim to transform the market towards the cutting edge of sustainability. Certification is a pertinent pathway to the transformation of the built environment, and a crucial function of the GBCSA as an independent third-party verifier. The GBCSA has, to date, certified over 500 buildings which each represent a quantifiable reduced environmental and social impact associated with the built environment.

To this end, the GBCSA manages a suite of voluntary, market-based environmental rating tools for buildings, precincts and tenants, called Green Star, Energy and Water Performance (EWP), Net Zero and EDGE. These are a set of green building standards that projects can be certified through by the GBCSA to optimise the efficiency of buildings during the design, construction, operation and maintenance stages of the building lifecycle. These rating tools are available on the GBCSA website at www.gbcsa.org.za. Additional information about GBCSA, the GBCSA tools and the certification process is also available on this website.

The Department of Public Works and Infrastructure (DPWI) is the custodian of all government immovable assets and therefore the largest property owner in South Africa, managing in excess of 90 000 buildings. The DPWI has established a Property Management Trading Entity (PMTE) to ensure the optimal management and performance of immovable assets. Furthermore, Agrément SA an implementing entity of DPWI and government certification agency, was established to assess and certify, where deemed fit, non-standardised building and construction products and systems. To this effect the DPWI will partner with the GBCSA through Agrément SA to establish a custom government green building rating tool for existing buildings to enable the sustainable transformation of government buildings.

The GBCSA and Agrément South Africa are now soliciting quotes from competent service providers to customise the current EBP (Existing Building Performance) (v1) tool with a specific focus for government owned and/or occupied - buildings.

**The main objectives of the Existing Buildings Performance Government Building rating tool is to:**

1. Review of credit criteria for nuanced updates that are better aligned with relevant government procurement protocols, requirements, policies, systems and standard operating procedures to streamline certification requirements and related processes.
2. Simplification or adaptation of documentation requirements to better align with government procurement and supply chain management requirements.
3. The potential for deepening of the socio-economic criteria throughout the tool and alignment with government BBB-EE imperatives by reviewing Socio Economic Category (SEC) credits applicability.

## 2. INVITATION FOR QUOTES

Agrement South Africa requests quotes and price quotations from suitable suppliers to offer the following services, as part of this project quote:

- Manage the customisation of the Existing Buildings Performance Government Buildings rating tool, as set out in the scope of works
- Manage the government focused stakeholder workshops and incorporating the key findings into the customisation of the tool.
- Produce the excel spreadsheet that will document all credit updates to be distributed to Department of Public Works and Infrastructure (DPWI) and Agrément South Africa.

## 3. SCOPE OF WORK

The appointed service provider will be expected to perform the following services as duties and responsibilities:

- The service provider is expected to drive the custom tool process and address all project management and administrative needs to deliver the end product. The GBCSA only provides technical review input on any proposed customisations.
- The base tool for the customization is Existing Building Performance (EBP) v1. It is envisioned that EBP v1, select credits the Socio-Economic Category (SEC) Pilot will form the basis for the credits to be reviewed.
- The scope of buildings includes national, provincial and local government funded Existing Buildings that are designed or constructed (where government is the developer/ project owner). However, only national based policies, standards or guidelines will be eligible for review, where appropriate. A limit of 5-10 key national policies is set for the services provider to be reviewed. This list will be identified with the stakeholders within the first stakeholder engagement session.

- The Green Star SA- Custom EBP Government Building certification is created to ensure that environmental impacts are considered at the operationalstage of a building, and the documentation to validate these conditions is specific to that which can be demonstrated at the operation and management stage only. Existing Building Performance certification is created to ensure the same environmental impacts are considered that were considered for the Design & As-Built Tools. However, the focus in the EBP Tool is directed on the operational phase of a building's lifecycle. This is to ensure that the operations and management of the building are efficient in order to maintain optimal performance. The Green Star – Custom Government EBP certification requires items such as energy and water to be monitored, as well as management policies and plans to be validated over a 12-month period as part of an operational approach. The documentation required to verify are operational policies, actual measurements and on-the-ground confirmation.

- Building typologies eligible to register currently without GBCSA Eligibility Ruling are:
    - Offices – G1
    - Retail developments: Large shops – F1
    - Public Assembly: Entertainment – A1, Worship – A4, Exhibition Hall – C1, Libraries – C2, Museum – C2
    - Education: Places of instruction – A3

  * **Note that combinations of eligible building types (Mixed-Use Buildings) will be considered as eligible.**

  In addition, the following building types may be eligible to register for certification, but require an Eligibility Ruling Request to be sent to the GBCSA before being able to do so.

  Building typologies requiring an Eligibility Ruling from GBCSA to register currently are:
    - Multi-unit residential – Housing H3
    - Industrial warehouse: Moderate Risk Storage – J2
    - Light industrial manufacture – low-risk industrial – D3
    - Laboratories
    - Health care: Hospital – E2
    - Indoor sport facilities: Theatrical & indoor sport – A2

.

- No technical manual will be produced by the service provider for DPWI and Agrément South Africa. The end product is an excel based spreadsheet that lists all credits with final criteria and references appropriate Technical Manual documentation requirements, with any

deviations noted within the excel spreadsheet. A revised technical manual will not be issued for the customisation.

- All stakeholder delegates are to be identified nominated, contacted and secured by DPWI, Agrément South Africa, and GBCSA. Their finalised contact details and secured dates will be provided to the service provider. Agrément South Africa will be responsible for securing suitable venues and catering. The service provider will facilitate the stakeholder sessions.
- This is not a major tool update that will allow for benchmarks to be adjusted. The Custom tool scope is limited to the principles outlined below.

### 3.1. Custom Tool Principals

The following principals are fundamental to eligibility of any custom tool and project that wishes to be certified by the GBCSA using the custom tool path:

1. **Leverage Existing Credit Library using 80/20 principal*:*** Any new custom tool must consist of at least approximately 80% existing GBCSA credits and credit criteria, which are to be taken from a mix of existing Green Star SA credits and credit criteria.

2. **Limited Changes Possible, based on other GBCSA rating tools, based on project based sound arguments:** Projects are to propose any alterations to existing credits or any new credits, through soundly motivated arguments presented to the GBCSA – this can only be in the form of referencing other GBC rating tool credits and benchmarks already established in Green Star (SA and Australia), LEED, BREEAM, WELL & The Living Building Challenge. No completely new credit criteria and benchmarks can be developed, and no completely new credits can be added that don't exist in other Green Star tools (SA or Australia). Innovative government processes and procedures that drive sustainability can be developed as credits as Innovation Challenges by the service provider. This will be limited to a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 3 credits.

3. **Industry/Consultant Peer Review:** The GBCSA uses its industry-based community of experts to peer review any proposed changes and additions, as well as the overall tool.

4. **Leverage Existing Certification Process:** the existing submission, certification and Technical Clarifications (TCs)[1]/Credit Interpretation Requests (CIRs)[2] processes would be

used, even though initially the custom projects will not be able to be submitted via the certification engine because the rating tool has not been configured in the engine.

5. **Consistency between custom tools of the same type:** The same custom tool developed should be used for projects in the same sector, where the space type mix is the same. Improvements and corrections can be made through TCs and CIRs.

6. **The final un-weighted points available within the tool should remain within 5% of the total points within the Green Star SA - EBPv1 rating tool:** Deviations beyond this must be clearly motivated.

### 3.2 Custom tool process

The custom tool is to be developed along the following process involving three key stages:

**Confirming scope & eligibility criteria**

The service provider will be required to consult directly with the GBCSA and Agrément South Africa on the scope and eligibility criteria associated with this custom tool in a way that is relevant for government buildings. This will include a focused half day session between the service provider, GBCSA, Agrément South Africa and DPWI (with 5-10 nominated government stakeholders).

The key objectives of this half day workshop are to introduce the project, confirm the stakeholder engagement methodology (this includes identifying appropriate stakeholder needs), define the scope (in terms of what building typologies this will apply to) and eligibility criteria (particularly in respect to government ownership of projects) for the project.

**Customisation**

The customization of the tool by the service provider will be informed by 2 stakeholder engagement sessions or phases with government/public sector (80%) and private sector (20%) representation. Stakeholder engagement is limited to 8 focus groups (4 focus groups per stakeholder engagement session/phase), by tool category or credits (i.e. specialisation of the stakeholders). Stakeholder sessions are limited to a total of 15 individuals (public and private) per focus group. The service provider will rely on DPWI and Agrément South Africa to guide and secure representation of national, provincial and local government whilst the GBCSA will be responsible for securing private sector representation.

The service provider will need to co-ordinate the stakeholder sessions so that focus groups are, at a minimum, facilitated consecutively for 2 days. Stakeholder Engagement 1 and 2 will therefore include

one session of 2 consecutive focus group days and another session of 2 consecutive focus groups days each.

**Stakeholder Engagement 1: Customisation needs analysis**

The objective of Session 1 will be to engage with stakeholders to understand the customisation needs and scope. This will include 4 sessions of a 1 day long workshop each in which credits are individually reviewed in terms of aim, credit criteria and typical documentation in order to unpack where the current barriers are and identify opportunities for customisation for the purposes of making certification more streamlined for government to implement. The service provider will be responsible for devising the most appropriate workshop format for interactive inputs and identifying what needs to be customised. This involves structuring the stakeholder sessions into appropriate targeted groupings so as to garner the correct technical input. For example, government officials involved in the procurement of building services related input would need to be present for the Water, Energy, Emissions and IEQ (Indoor Environmental Quality) related category credit stakeholder sessions. The customisation will involve reviewing each credit against 4 key areas for opportunities to update:

1. The Green Star SA – Existing Building Performance(EBP) v1 Tool credits should be reviewed for applicability to the spaces in government buildings and either be flagged as applicable or not, and if any adaptations to the credit are required, these should be highlighted and proposed.
2. The potential for deepening of the socio-economic criteria throughout the tool and alignment with government BBB-EE imperatives by reviewing SEC credits applicability.
3. Simplification or adaptation of documentation requirements to better align with government procurement, supply chain management requirements and key national policies.

As part of the customisation review process the service provider will also be expected to review Agrément South Africa's certification and propose ways in which this can be rewarded appropriately within select credit criteria. Agrément South Africa will make available any necessary documentation required by the service provider timeously.

The service provider is expected to then incorporate all the feedback obtained from the stakeholder sessions, and focused reviews for a limited number of specific credit criteria updates (eg. innovations) where alternative standards needs to be reviewed, into an excel spreadsheet that provides visual track changes of credit customisations.

**Stakeholder Engagement 2: Draft Custom Tool presentation**

The objective of Session 2 will be to feedback to the stakeholders on the initial rating tool customisation and allow for any last comments and technical feedback. This will involve presenting those credits that were identified for customisation from Session 1 and unpacking the detail of the recommended customisation thereof for further input and discussion. This also involves 4 sessions of

a day each, arranged according to appropriate tool credit/categories groupings, as recommended by the service provider. The service provider must incorporate the final feedback into the excel spreadsheet with visual track changes and issue as the first draft to the GBCSA for review.

The GBCSA will review the draft approach and approve in principle the go-ahead of the Custom development process. The GBCSA may suggest alterations to the quote put forward and reserves the right to approve or reject all proposed changes.

Approaches put forward typically shows that for the most part, the adaptation required in developing the Custom rating tool is relatively minor, mostly using credit criteria already developed in current Green Star SA tools. The adaptation (development) work will be undertaken by the service provider themselves as opposed to the GBCSA, and leaves the testing of the applicability of credit criteria with Agrément South Africa and DPWI after the tool has been developed , who will be most familiar with the specific technical requirements of the credit in application to their buildings. The testing of the Custom tool falls outside of the project scope.

Minor adaptation would typically involve the following:

- Minor edits to some credits to make them less prescriptive to specific building types
- Introduction of N/A clauses to exclude certain spaces from some credit criteria
- Review the number of points allocated
- Updating documentation requirements to better align with government procurement policies
- Incorporating SEC related credit as per government BBB-EE procurement policies

Major adaptation would typically involve the following:

- As per ‘minor’ adaptation
- Editing the points allocation to credits
- Re-working of calculators, modelling protocols etc. to address different space types.

In terms of development deliverables, the rating tool spreadsheet will be delivered and approved first, before the associated documentation requirements edits.

**Peer review**

The proposed draft Custom Tool developed by the service provider, and approved after Session 2, will then be Peer Reviewed by GBCSA and ASA industry-based community of experts, to Peer Review any proposed changes and additions, as well as the overall tool. The peer review will take approximately 6-8 weeks. The Peer Reviewer will consider the following:

- Do any proposed alterations to a credit detract from the aim of credit?
- Do any proposed alterations to a credit conflict with other parts of that credit?

- Do any proposed alterations to a credit make it more difficult for the assessment panel to verify compliance with credit criteria?
- In the case of new credits, is the information required for each new credit sufficient for the assessment panel to verify compliance with credit criteria?
- In the case of credits that were not included in the new rating tool, is the justification for them not to be included sufficient? If not, why not?

There would be final feedback loop requesting additional changes coming out of the peer review, which the Custom service provider would need to respond to, updating the excel spreadsheet accordingly.

## 4. DELIVERABLES/EXPECTED OUTPUTS

At the end of the Green Star SA – Custom process, a customised rating tool for use on government buildings will be issued. As part of the development/customisation process the service provider will be required to provide the following deliverables to the GBCSA for approval:

- A Green Star SA – Custom: Government Building rating tool spreadsheet (first deliverable to be approved)
- A Green Star SA – Custom: Government Building documentation requirements (*see below for further detail)
- Relevant Green Star SA – Custom: Government calculators, and calculator guides
- Summary of changes made for each credit in the tool as well as any changes made to calculators and guides. This must accompany each of the deliverables above.
- Stakeholder engagement outcome reports.

A summary of deliverables is provided in the table below, which includes, but is not limited to, the key tasks that will need to be performed in order to develop the custom tool.

## 5. QUALIFYING CRITERIA: TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONALITY

| **Functionality Criteria** | **Description of functionality criteria** | **Maximum number of tender evaluation points** |
|---|---|---|
| **Relevant Experience** | **AP Status:**<br>**MORE THAN 3 YEARS' EXPERIENCE OF GREEN STAR EBP SUBMISSIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS** | **10** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Provide AP certificate as proof of EBP AP qualification<br>AND<br>Provide either:<br>• GBCSA Certification Engine emails of Project submissions with date before March 2017<br>OR<br>GBCSA Certification Engine emails of Round 2: Assessment confirming the rating achieved with date before March 2017.<br>(Table A for points allocation) | |
| **Certification** | **CERTIFICATION SUBMISSION EXPERIENCE AND CUSTOMISATION EXPERIENCE:**<br>At least 3 EBP certified projects. **(10 points)**<br>Provide either:<br>• GBCSA Certification Engine emails of Round 2: Assessment confirming the rating achieved.<br>OR<br>• Case Studies downloaded from GBCSA website.<br><br>**CUSTOM PROJECT OR ACTING AS A PEER REVIEWER FOR A CUSTOM TOOL. (10 points)**<br>Provide either:<br>• Case Studies downloaded from GBCSA website.<br>OR<br>• Correspondence with GBCSA (emails or otherwise) of Custom Project registration, or Custom Project certification.<br>OR<br>• Correspondence with GBCSA (emails or otherwise) of request to Peer Review Custom Tool.<br><br>**TECHNICAL OWNERSHIP OF ANY ENE-1 AND WAT-1 REPORTS WITHIN A SUBMISSION AND/OR PROVIDING INPUT INTO THE EBP ENERGY OR WATER CALCULATOR TOOL DEVELOPMENT TWGs. (10 points)**<br>Provide either: | **40** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • Screenshot of GBCSA Certification submission category upload for ENE-1 & WAT-1.<br>OR<br>• Excel or PDF of ENE & WAT calculator generated for Project submitted for certification.<br>OR<br>Correspondence with GBCSA on Energy & Water Performance (EWP) Tool or other energy or water calculator tool development.<br>**FAMILIARITY WITH THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CATEGORY (SEC) PILOT TOOL CREDITS AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS. (10 points)**<br>Provide either:<br>Evidence that you have worked with the SEC Tool by using SEC as Innovation credit in 1 of your Projects.<br>OR<br>Evidence that you have certified a SEC Project.<br>(Table B for points allocation) | |
| **Tool Development** | **TECHNICAL TOOL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE**<br>Provide evidence of rating tool development either as a lead technical consultant or as a member of the Technical Working Group (TWG).<br>Provide either:<br>Correspondence with GBCSA on development of rating tool i.e. email, agenda, minutes could be used as examples.<br>(Table C for points allocation) | **10** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Involvement** | **GBCSA FACULTY/ASSESSOR/TAG EXPERIENCE**<br>Provide evidence of correspondence with GBCSA that you have been used in the capacity of Faculty, Assessor/Moderator, TAG.<br>Provide either:<br>This could come in the form of email,<br>OR<br>screenshot from Certification Engine showing assigning of Assessor /Moderator,<br>OR<br>An invoice for work done in these capacities,<br>OR<br>Zendesk ticket could be used as examples.<br>(Table C for points allocation) | **10** |
| **Understanding of Brief** | Custom tool and stakeholder methodology<br>(Table D for points allocation) | **30** |
| **Total evaluation points for quality** | | **100** |

**SUBMISSION OF QUOTES**

- National Treasury's Central Supplier Database (CSD) report. It must be noted that no contract with a service provider will be entered if such service provider is not registered on the CSD,
- Valid B-BBEE Certificate,
- Valid Tax Clearance Certificate,
- Completed and Signed Standard Bidding Document SBD 4, SBD 6.1, SBD 8, SBD 9.
- Signed General Conditions of Contract.
- All quotes will be evaluated by an evaluation team for functionality and price
- All quotes should include:
  - Demonstrated understanding of the brief
  - Proposed overall approach for Custom tool development, including:
  - Management of the Custom tool process
  - Management of government stakeholder inputs
  - Delivery of outputs
  - Description of resources to be allocated to deliver on the custom tool, including an indication of which team members will be allocated which portions of work
  - A detailed work plan for delivery of the rating tool customisation
  - Detailed fee quote
  - Proposed payment schedule (cash flow), based on deliverables at progressive milestone stages of the project
  - Company's experience on such projects

**After considering the functional criteria, a bidder is considered to have passed the functional requirements if they have scored 60 points or more to be considered for Price and BBBEE**

**6. Evaluation Phases:**

The following formula will be used to convert the points scored against the weight:

$$Ps = \left(\frac{So}{Ms}\right) x100$$

Where:

Ps = Percentage scored for functionality by bid under consideration

So = Total score of bid under consideration

Ms = Maximum possible score

Service providers will be expected to achieve a minimum threshold score of 70% in order to proceed to Phase 2.

**Phase 2: Calculation of points**

Please note for quotations or bids above R10 000 up to R50 Million, ASA evaluates these in terms of the 80/20 preference point system where:

80 points are allocated for price and 20 points are allocated for the service provider's B-BBEE Level of Contribution. An original or certified copy of a B-BBEE certificate must be submitted to substantiate claims for preference points.

A due diligence process in a form of a presentation will be conducted in respect of all short-listed bidders. A set of questions will be posed during the presentation. Should the bidder fail to meet the requirements of the due diligence process, their quotewill be disregarded at this stage.

ASA also reserves the right to conduct an investigation of the bidder's financial position, previous contracts carried out, availability of skills or knowledge, existing workload, etc.

During phase 2, points for price will be calculated for all shortlisted service providers in accordance with the following formula:

$$Ps = 80\left(1 - \frac{Pt - P\min}{P\min}\right)$$

Where:

Ps = Points scored for price of quotation under consideration

Pt = Rand value of quotation under consideration

Pmin = Rand value of lowest acceptable quotation

The final points will be calculated as follows:

| CRITERIA | SUB-CRITERIA | WEIGHTING POINTS |
|---|---|---|
| Price | Detailed budget breakdown | 80 |



innovative construction product assessments

**Tel:** +27 (12) 841 3708 **Web:** www.agrement.co.za **Email:** agrement@agrement.co.za

**Address:** Building 17B, 2nd Floor, Scientia Campus, Meiring Naudé Road, Brummeria, Pretoria

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B-BBEE (Status Level Verification Certificate) | B-BBEE Level Contributor | 20 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

**POINTS AWARDED FOR B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTOR**

In terms of Regulation 6 (2) and 7 (2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points must be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table below:

| B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor | Number of points (80/20 system) |
|---|---|
| 1 | 20 |
| 2 | 18 |
| 3 | 14 |
| 4 | 12 |
| 5 | 8 |
| 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 2 |
| Non-compliant contributor | 0 |

EMEs are deemed to have a B-BBEE status level four (4) contributor, in instances where EMEs are more that 50% black owned, such enterprise qualify for promotion to a BBBEE status level three (3) contributor and points will be awarded accordingly.

Please note that the quotes will be evaluated using the 80/20 preference point system.

A recommendation for award will then be formulated for approval by the relevant delegated authority.

Applications not including all the above information will not be reviewed. Only short-listed candidates will be contacted. Interested parties must submit, their applications **no later than Friday, 12 June 2020 at 16:30 via email to**: **procurement@agrement.co.za**.

**NO LATE SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED**



innovative construction product assessments

**Tel:** +27 (12) 841 3708 **Web:** www.agrement.co.za **Email:** agrement@agrement.co.za
**Address:** Building 17B, 2nd Floor, Scientia Campus, Meiring Naudé Road, Brummeria, Pretoria

## 7. COPYRIGHT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

In consideration of the fees paid, the service provider expressly assigns to ASA any copyright arising from the works the consultant produces while executing this contract. The consultant may not use, reproduce or otherwise disseminate or authorise others to use, reproduce or disseminate such works without prior consent from ASA.



**Tel:** +27 (12) 841 3708 **Web:** www.agrement.co.za **Email:** agrement@agrement.co.za
**Address:** Building 17B, 2nd Floor, Scientia Campus, Meiring Naudé Road, Brummeria, Pretoria

**Table A**: The scoring of relevant experience in the organization will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|---|---|
| **Poor (score 0)** | Successful submissions and certifications of Green Star EBP projects over less than the last year or no experience of Green Star EBP. |
| **Satisfactory (score 5)** | Successful submissions and certifications of Green Star EBP projects over the past 1 – 2 years. |
| **Good (score 10)** | Successful submissions and certifications of Green Star EBP projects over the past 3 years. |

**Table B**: The scoring of relevant experience in key Certification areas identified will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|---|---|
| **Poor (score 0)** | No previous experience and understanding of this aspect of the Certification area. (3 x Certified Projects \| Custom Project/Tool \| ENE-1 & WAT-1 \| SEC ). |
| **Satisfactory (score 20)** | Lacking experience and understanding of this aspect of the Certification area and could have less aspects than criteria requested. (3 x Certified Projects \| Custom Project/Tool \| ENE-1 & WAT-1 \| SEC ). |
| **Very good (score 40)** | In-depth relevant previous experience and understanding of this aspect of the Certification area with all aspects supplied. (3 x Certified Projects \| Custom Project/Tool \| ENE-1 & WAT-1 \| SEC ). |

**Table C**: The scoring of relevant experience for Tool Development & Involvement areas identified will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|---|---|
| **Poor (score 0)** | No previous knowledge and understanding of this aspect identified to contribute to a fuller Tool adaption process. (Tool Development \| Faculty, Assessor/Moderator, TAG). |
| **Satisfactory (score 5)** | Lacking of knowledge and understanding of this aspect identified to contribute to a fuller Tool adaption process. (Tool Development \| Faculty, Assessor/Moderator, TAG). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Very good (score 10)** | In-depth relevant previous knowledge and understanding of this aspect identified to contribute to a fuller Tool adaption process. (Tool Development \| Faculty, Assessor/Moderator, TAG). |

**Table D**: The scoring of the approach for The Understanding of Brief will be as follows:

| Score | Technical approach and methodology |
|---|---|
| **Poor (score 0)** | The Tool and stakeholder approach and / or methodology is poor / is unlikely to satisfy project objectives or requirements. The tenderer has misunderstood certain aspects of the scope of work and does not deal with the critical aspects of the project. |
| **Satisfactory (score 10)** | The Tool and stakeholder approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology. The approach does not adequately deal with the critical characteristics of the project.<br>The quality plan, manner in which risk is to be managed etc. is too generic. |
| **Good (score 25)** | The Tool and stakeholder approach is specifically tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology and is sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes that may occur during execution. The quality plan and approach to managing risk etc. is specifically tailored to the critical characteristics of the project. |
| **Very good (score 30)** | Besides meeting the "good" rating, the important issues are approached in an innovative and efficient way, indicating that the tenderer has outstanding knowledge of state-of-the-art approaches.<br>The approach paper details ways to improve the project outcomes and the quality of the outputs. |



innovative construction product assessments
**Tel:** +27 (12) 841 3708 **Web:** www.agrement.co.za **Email:** agrement@agrement.co.za
**Address:** Building 17B, 2nd Floor, Scientia Campus, Meiring Naudé Road, Brummeria, Pretoria