

MIYAR

Design Brief + RFQ Pack

Technical Specification & Variable Analysis

Zen

February 25, 2026

CONFIDENTIAL — FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

Document ID: MYR-DES-4-mm20c11r

Scoring Engine:	MIYAR Decision Intelligence V2
Model Version:	v2.0.0
Generated:	2026-02-25T12:25:15.087Z
Document ID:	MYR-DES-4-mm20c11r
Reproducibility:	All inputs, weights, thresholds, and benchmark data are frozen at generation time. Re-evaluation with identical inputs and the same benchmark/logic version will produce identical scores.

Executive Summary

NOT VALIDATED

COMPOSITE SCORE

48.1

Critical

RISK-ADJUSTED SCORE

28.3

Critical

CONFIDENCE

90%

High

Dimension Score Breakdown

Dimension	Score (0-100)	Weight	Weighted	Grade
Strategic Alignment	75.0	25%	18.8	Strong
Financial Feasibility	36.6	20%	7.3	Critical
Market Positioning	76.5	20%	15.3	Strong
Differentiation Strength	42.5	20%	8.5	Critical
Execution Risk	55.0	15%	8.3	Weak
Composite	48.1	100%	48.1	Critical

Variable Contribution Analysis

How each input variable contributes to each dimension score:

Differentiation Strength

Variable	Contribution
des04_n	+0.19
des02_n	+0.10
str02_n	+0.07
competitorInverse	+0.06

Execution Risk

Variable	Contribution
executionResilience	+0.17
complexityInverse	+0.15
supplyChainInverse	+0.13
approvalsInverse	+0.10

Financial Feasibility

Variable	Contribution
budgetFit	+0.11
fin02_n	+0.10
executionResilience	+0.10
costStability	+0.06

Market Positioning

Variable	Contribution
marketFit	+0.35
des04_n	+0.15
trendFit	+0.14
differentiationPressure	+0.13

Strategic Alignment

Variable	Contribution
str01_n	+0.26

str03_n	+0.19
compatVisionDesign	+0.15
compatVisionMarket	+0.15

Sensitivity Analysis

Top 8 variables ranked by impact on composite score when adjusted ±1 unit:

Variable	Sensitivity	Score (+1)	Score (-1)	Range
str02Differentiation	6.12	50.3	44.1	6.1
des04Experience	4.50	50.4	45.9	4.5
str03BuyerMaturity	3.13	49.7	46.6	3.1
exe02Contractor	2.31	49.3	47.0	2.3
exe04QaMaturity	2.31	49.3	47.0	2.3
fin02Flexibility	2.00	49.1	47.1	2.0
des02MaterialLevel	2.00	48.4	46.4	2.0
fin01BudgetCap	2.00	49.1	47.1	2.0

Risk Assessment

RISK SCORE

56.7

PENALTIES APPLIED

1

Active Penalties

P3: Budget fit below 0.4 (Effect: -10.0)

Risk Flags

FIN_SEVERE

Recommended Actions

1 conditional action(s) identified:

- Trigger: FIN_SEVERE

Recommendation: Adjust specification level or budget range. Consider 2 alternative material tiers.

Variables: fin01BudgetCap, des02MaterialLevel

5-Lens Defensibility Framework

OVERALL DEFENSIBILITY

48

Critical

WEAKEST LENS

—

Priority improvement area

Market Fit Lens

77/100

The project scores 76.5/100 on market fit, positioning it within the Upper-mid tier with moderate competitive intensity. Strong alignment with target market benchmarks.

Evidence: Market Tier: Upper-mid • Competitor Intensity: 4 • Trend Sensitivity: 4

Cost Discipline Lens

37/100

Financial feasibility scores 36.6/100. Budget cap of AED 110/sqft with flexibility rating 3/5. Budget constraints pose significant risk to project delivery.

Evidence: Budget Cap (AED/sqft): 110 • Budget Flexibility: 3 • Shock Tolerance: 2

Differentiation Lens

75/100

Strategic alignment scores 75.0/100. Brand clarity at 4/5 with differentiation at 2/5 in Modern style. Strong differentiation positions this project competitively.

Evidence: Brand Clarity: 4 • Differentiation Score: 2 • Design Style: Modern

Procurement Feasibility Lens

55/100

Execution readiness scores 55.0/100. Supply chain readiness at 3/5 with contractor capability at 2/5. Execution capabilities are adequate but may need reinforcement.

Evidence: Supply Chain Readiness: 3 • Contractor Capability: 2 • Approvals Readiness: 3

Brand/Vision Alignment Lens

43/100

Design specification scores 42.5/100. Material level 3/5 with complexity 2/5 and experience quality 4/5. Design specifications may be misaligned with project constraints.

Evidence: Material Level: 3 • Design Complexity: 2 • Experience Quality: 4

Material Board Annex

No material boards have been created for this project. Use the Board Composer to build material boards with cost estimates and RFQ-ready procurement schedules.

Evidence References

No evidence records linked to this project at the time of report generation.

Evidence Trace & Provenance

Document ID: MYR-DES-4-mm20c11r
Project ID: 4
Benchmark Version: BV-1.0.0
Logic Version: MIYAR Logic v1.0 – Baseline
Model Version: v2.0.0
Generated: 2026-02-25T12:25:15.088Z
Scoring Engine: MIYAR Decision Intelligence V2
Hash: TVlSLURFUy00LW1t

This document contains a cryptographic evidence trace linking the scoring inputs, benchmark data version, logic version (weights + thresholds), and model configuration used at the time of generation. Any modification to the underlying data would produce a different document hash, ensuring auditability and defensibility of the decision record.

Project Input Summary

Context

Parameter	Value
Typology	Mixed-use
Scale	Medium
GFA (sqm)	209,000
Location	Prime
Delivery Horizon	24-36m

Strategy

Parameter	Value
Brand Clarity	4/5
Differentiation	2/5
Buyer Maturity	4/5

Market

Parameter	Value
Market Tier	Upper-mid
Competitor Intensity	4/5
Trend Sensitivity	4/5

Financial

Parameter	Value
Budget Cap (AED/sqft)	110
Flexibility	3/5
Shock Tolerance	2/5
Sales Premium	4/5

Design

Parameter	Value
Style	Modern
Material Level	3/5
Complexity	2/5

Experience	4/5
Sustainability	1/5

Execution

Parameter	Value
Supply Chain	3/5
Contractor	2/5
Approvals	3/5
QA Maturity	4/5

Important Disclaimer

This document is a **concept-level assessment** generated by the MIYAR Decision Intelligence Platform. All scores, recommendations, and specifications are **advisory only** and are subject to detailed design, engineering review, and professional validation. Material specifications, cost estimates, and procurement guidance are indicative and must be confirmed through formal tender processes. MIYAR does not warrant the accuracy of third-party benchmark data or market intelligence used in this assessment. This document does not constitute professional design, financial, or legal advice.