

FUNCTIONALITY TABLE

Scoring of Elements relevant to each criterion (Applicable value)	EVALUATION SCORING			
	Points	Weight	Criteria	Functionality Points Allocation
ORGANISATIONAL PROFILE				
The tendering entity to provide evidence of completion of a single residential development of R500 million CAPEX	10	Inadequate 0%	No Projects	0
		Poor 40%	Less than R500 million project CAPEX	4
		Satisfactory 80%	R500 to R750 million project CAPEX	8
		Excellent 100%	More than R750 million project CAPEX	10
CV of the Project Lead demonstrating a minimum of five years individual experience and expertise in the development of residential properties.	10	Inadequate 0%	No Information Provided	0
		Satisfactory 80%	5-8 years' experience as a Project Lead with at least 1 project exceeding a CAPEX of R500 million	8
		Excellent 100%	Greater than 8 years' experience as a Project Lead with at least 1 project exceeding a CAPEX of R500 million	10
Sub-Total	20			

DEVELOPMENT & CONCEPT PLAN [REFER TO CLAUSE 2.2.1.1.5.1 (A) BELOW]

It is to be noted that each Objective below should be scored individually as per the indicted Weighting and Functionality Points Allocation

1. OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure legible spatial structure 2. OBJECTIVE 2: Create good quality open space through placemaking 3. OBJECTIVE 3: Contribute to the creation of healthy and safe communities 4. OBJECTIVE 4: Design streets as positive public space 5. OBJECTIVE 5: Promote intensity, diversity and adaptability of uses 6. OBJECTIVE 6: Ensure positive interfaces onto the public realm 7. OBJECTIVE 8: Value and enhance green open spaces 8. OBJECTIVE 9: Respond to the character and identification of an area	2.5 FOR EACH OBJECTIVE (Total 20)	Inadequate 0%	Concept Plan demonstrating no submission to Urban Design PER Objective	0
		Poor 40%	Concept Plan demonstrating poor responsiveness to Urban Design PER Objective	1
		Satisfactory 80%	Concept Plan demonstrating moderate responsiveness to Urban Design PER Objective	2
		Excellent 100%	Concept Plan demonstrating full responsiveness to Urban Design PER Objective	2.5
Value to residents [Refer to Clause 2.2.1.1.5.1(b) below]	5	Inadequate 0%	No additional value-add to residents	0
		Moderate 60%	Medium impact value-add to residents	3
		Excellent 100%	High Impact value-add to residents	5
Percentage of Nano / micro units (18-25m²) in development scheme	5	Inadequate 0%	Greater than 40%	0
		Poor 40%	31%- 40%	2
		Moderate 60%	21%- 30%	3
		Satisfactory 80%	11%- 20%	4
		Excellent 100%	10% or less	5
Sub-total	30			

FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Percentage of the land price offer relative to development CAPEX	10	Inadequate 0%	Greater than 10%	0
		Excellent 100%	Less or equal to 10%	10
Annual Rental Price Adjustments on Affordable Rental Housing (for a period of 10 years post-initial tenanting of the development)	10	Inadequate 0%	Above 6%	0
		Satisfactory 80%	4.1% - 6%	8
		Excellent 100%	3% - 4%	10
Operational: Debt Service Cover Ratio (DSCR) on Affordable Rental Housing	5	Inadequate 0%	Less than 1.00	0
		Moderate 60%	1.00 – 1.25	3
		Satisfactory 80%	1.26 – 1.3	4
		Excellent 100%	Greater than 1.3	5
Long-term maintenance capital reserve on the Affordable Rental Portfolio for a period of 20 years	5	Inadequate 0%	0%- <1.2%	0
		Poor 40%	1.21% - 1.5%	2
		Moderate 60%	1.51% - 1.8%	3
		Satisfactory 80%	1.81% - 2%	4
		Excellent 100%	Greater than 2%	5

Number of Affordable Rental Housing Units (Monthly Rentals capped at 30% of the targeted FSC threshold – Refer to Clause 2.2.1.1.5.1 below)	10	Inadequate 0%	Less than 200	0
		Poor 40%	200 – 299 units	4
		Moderate 60%	300 - 399 units	6
		Satisfactory 80%	400 to 449 units	8
		Excellent 100%	Greater than 450 units	10
First Year Net development yield on the Affordable Rental Portfolio (Annual Net Rental Income expressed as percentage of development capital costs)	10	Inadequate 0%	Less than 8%	0
		Moderate 60%	8% - 9%	6
		Satisfactory 80%	9.1%-10%	8
		Excellent 100%	Greater than 10%	10
Sub-total	50			
Total	100			

The minimum qualifying score for functionality is **70** out of a maximum of **100**.