



KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCE
EDUCATION
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200
Ex NED Building, 228 Pieter Maritz Street, Pietermaritzburg, 3201
Tel: 033 846 5505 Email: Funani.chiyi@kzndoe.gov.za

Supply Chain Management
Enquiries: F.F Chiyi
Date: 17.02.2023

ADVERT: QUOTATION NO: RQ 08/07
COMPONENT: FINANCE
DIVISION: SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT

QUOTATIONS ARE INVITED FOR THE UNDERMENTIONED REQUIREMENTS OF THE KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DESCRIPTION: APPOINTMENT OF SERVICE PROVIDER TO SUBMIT COSTED PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION OF: DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN

THIS SERVICE IS SUBJECT TO A COMPULSORY BRIEFING MEETING DETAILS OF WHICH ARE AS FOLLOWS:

DATE: 01 March 2022
TIME: Lecture Room A1, Dokkies (321 ZK Mathews Road, Umbilo)
VENUE: 10H00

CLOSING DATE FOR THIS QUOTATION/ PROPOSAL IS 13 March 2023

For technical enquiries: Any questions regarding services required must be sent via e-mail to:
lutchman.chetty@kzndoe.gov.za
Zanele.ntombela2@kzndoe.gov.za

FOR SCM Enquiries : funani.chiyi@kzndoe.gov.za



Private Bag X9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200
Ex NED Building, 228 Pieter Maritz Street, Pietermaritzburg, 3201
Tel: 033 846 5505 Email: Funani.chiyi@kzndoe.gov.za

Supply Chain Management
Enquiries: F.F Chiyi
Date: 17.02.2023

The Manager

Tel No: _____ Email address: _____

**SUBJECT: RQ08/07 INVITATION OF COSTED PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION OF :
DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN**

1. You are kindly invited to quote for the above mentioned service.
2. Please receive the following documents and return to 228 Pietermaritz Street, Pietermaritzburg, 3200.
 - SBD 1 INVITATION TO QUOTE PART 1 AND PART B (2 pages)
 - SBD 3.1 A SPECIFICATION TERMS OF REFERENCE Annexure A and Annexure B (9 pages)
 - SBD 3.1 B PRICE SCHEDULE (1 page)
 - SBD 4 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (2 pages)
 - SBD 6.1 PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM (5 pages)
3. Service providers must ensure that they update their details on the Central Supplier Database (CSD).
4. The quotation/ proposal will be evaluated on:
 - 4.1 Administrative compliance
 - 4.2 Technical compliance to specification and scored for functionality
 - 4.3 80/20 price and preference points basis 80 is for price and 20 is specific goals as per SBD6.1.
5. Quotations/ Proposals together with the following compliance documents: Original B-BBEE certificate or certified copy of affidavit must be deposited into quotation box situated at 228 Pietermaritz Street, visitor's entrance next to security cubicle.
6. Submit valid copy of tax Compliance Status Pin certificate/ Tax pin..
7. The closing date for quotations will be **13.03.2023 at 11h00**.
8. Your co-operation will be highly appreciated.

Mr. M. Mlangeni

Chief Director (SCM)

KZN: Department of Education

2023/02/17
Date

PART A INVITATION TO BID

YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO BID FOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE (NAME OF DEPARTMENT/ PUBLIC ENTITY)					
BID NUMBER:	RQ08/07	CLOSING DATE:	13.03.2023	CLOSING TIME:	11h00
DESCRIPTION	INVITATION OF COSTED PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION OF : DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN				
BID RESPONSE DOCUMENTS MAY BE DEPOSITED IN THE BID BOX SITUATED AT (STREET ADDRESS)					
Ground Floor, Visitors Entrance					
228 Pietermaritz Street					
Pietermaritzburg, 3201					
BIDDING PROCEDURE ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO			TECHNICAL ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:		
CONTACT PERSON	F.F Chiyi		CONTACT PERSON	N.Khomo	
TELEPHONE NUMBER	033 846 5505		TELEPHONE NUMBER	078 593 3193	
E-MAIL ADDRESS	funani.chiyi@kzndoe.gov.za		E-MAIL ADDRESS	Zanele.ntombela2@kzndoe.gov.za	
SUPPLIER INFORMATION					
NAME OF BIDDER					
POSTAL ADDRESS					
STREET ADDRESS					
TELEPHONE NUMBER	CODE		NUMBER		
CELLPHONE NUMBER					
FACSIMILE NUMBER	CODE		NUMBER		
E-MAIL ADDRESS					
VAT REGISTRATION NUMBER					
SUPPLIER COMPLIANCE STATUS	TAX COMPLIANCE SYSTEM PIN:		OR	CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE No:	MAAA
B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE	TICK APPLICABLE BOX] <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL SWORN AFFIDAVIT		TICK APPLICABLE BOX] <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
[A B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE/ SWORN AFFIDAVIT (FOR EMES & QSEs) MUST BE SUBMITTED IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR PREFERENCE POINTS FOR B-BBEE]					
ARE YOU THE ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA FOR THE GOODS /SERVICES /WORKS OFFERED?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No [IF YES ENCLOSE PROOF]		ARE YOU A FOREIGN BASED SUPPLIER FOR THE GOODS /SERVICES /WORKS OFFERED?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No [IF YES, ANSWER THE QUESTIONNAIRE BELOW]
QUESTIONNAIRE TO BIDDING FOREIGN SUPPLIERS					
IS THE ENTITY A RESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA)?			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
DOES THE ENTITY HAVE A BRANCH IN THE RSA?			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
DOES THE ENTITY HAVE A PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT IN THE RSA?			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
DOES THE ENTITY HAVE ANY SOURCE OF INCOME IN THE RSA?			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
IS THE ENTITY LIABLE IN THE RSA FOR ANY FORM OF TAXATION?			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
IF THE ANSWER IS "NO" TO ALL OF THE ABOVE, THEN IT IS NOT A REQUIREMENT TO REGISTER FOR A TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS SYSTEM PIN CODE FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVENUE SERVICE (SARS) AND IF NOT REGISTER AS PER 2.3 BELOW.					

PART B TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR BIDDING

1. BID SUBMISSION:	
1.1.	BIDS MUST BE DELIVERED BY THE STIPULATED TIME TO THE CORRECT ADDRESS. LATE BIDS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED FOR CONSIDERATION.
1.2.	ALL BIDS MUST BE SUBMITTED ON THE OFFICIAL FORMS PROVIDED-(NOT TO BE RE-TYPED) OR IN THE MANNER PRESCRIBED IN THE BID DOCUMENT.
1.3.	THIS BID IS SUBJECT TO THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK ACT, 2000 AND THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2017, THE GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT (GCC) AND, IF APPLICABLE, ANY OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT.
1.4.	THE SUCCESSFUL BIDDER WILL BE REQUIRED TO FILL IN AND SIGN A WRITTEN CONTRACT FORM (SBD7).
2. TAX COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS	
2.1	BIDDERS MUST ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR TAX OBLIGATIONS.
2.2	BIDDERS ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THEIR UNIQUE PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (PIN) ISSUED BY SARS TO ENABLE THE ORGAN OF STATE TO VERIFY THE TAXPAYER'S PROFILE AND TAX STATUS.
2.3	APPLICATION FOR TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS (TCS) PIN MAY BE MADE VIA E-FILING THROUGH THE SARS WEBSITE WWW.SARS.GOV.ZA .
2.4	BIDDERS MAY ALSO SUBMIT A PRINTED TCS CERTIFICATE TOGETHER WITH THE BID.
2.5	IN BIDS WHERE CONSORTIA / JOINT VENTURES / SUB-CONTRACTORS ARE INVOLVED, EACH PARTY MUST SUBMIT A SEPARATE TCS CERTIFICATE / PIN / CSD NUMBER.
2.6	WHERE NO TCS PIN IS AVAILABLE BUT THE BIDDER IS REGISTERED ON THE CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE (CSD), A CSD NUMBER MUST BE PROVIDED.
2.7	NO BIDS WILL BE CONSIDERED FROM PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE, COMPANIES WITH DIRECTORS WHO ARE PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE, OR CLOSE CORPORATIONS WITH MEMBERS PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE."

NB: FAILURE TO PROVIDE / OR COMPLY WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE PARTICULARS MAY RENDER THE BID INVALID.

SIGNATURE OF BIDDER:

.....

CAPACITY UNDER WHICH THIS BID IS SIGNED:

.....

(Proof of authority must be submitted e.g. company resolution)

DATE:

.....

Annexure A

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PROVINCIAL ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PAIP)

1. Background

In order to reduce training costs and redirect funds to high pressure areas, the department introduced the Provincial Academic Improvement Programme which provides in-house training and offers support to learners during the holiday periods. The Provincial Academic Improvement Plan informed the drawing up of the District and Schools' Academic Performance Improvement Plans. The District Academic Improvement Plans are funded to the tune of R80 million to hold supplementary tuition across all twelve districts.

Multi-Disciplinary Team visits were conducted in all Districts to support all underperforming schools, including serial underperforming schools which are secondary schools that have been achieving 65% and below for three years in succession. Some districts have also held stakeholder indabas with a view to solicit support from all stakeholders with an interest in education. All districts have forged partnerships with Non-Governmental Organisations, Non-Profit Organisations and the business sector and there are programmes aimed at supporting underperforming schools which are funded by these stakeholders.

The purpose of the plan is two-fold. There are whole school system outcomes which address learner performance at both General Education and Training and Further Education and Training bands. There are Grade 12 specific outcomes which address the improvement of the National Senior Certificate examination results.

Importance of the evaluation

Outcome 3 (Youths leaving the schooling system more prepared to contribute towards a prosperous and equitable South Africa) – Priority 3 of the MTSF focuses on basic education, and the curriculum is fundamental to its implementation and improved learning outcomes. This evaluation will be a formative evaluation aimed at uncovering implementation challenges and highlighting good practice with a view to learning. It is aimed at improving the implementation of PAIP. It could also lead to the strengthening of the PAIP in support to effective implementation.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

To evaluate whether the FET curriculum has been implemented as specified in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) and how implementation can be strengthened. It will include the extent to which various programmes and policy instruments have worked and/or not worked and why, with the recommendations for policy or programme change and improvement in the provision of Provincial Academic Improvement Programme.

The service provider will be sought in this regard to conduct full evaluation.

Key questions to be addressed/ scope of evaluation

1. What other intervention are aimed at supporting improved learner attainment at grade 12 in KZN?
2. What does the KZN PAIP set out to do (in broad terms, and then specifically in relation to Grade 12 learner support)?

3. What is the budget allocation and budget breakdown for Grade 12 learner support?
4. What are the planned / documented ways in which the efficacy of the KZN PAIP Grade 12 learner support is to be measured?
5. What are the envisaged impacts (and related unit costs) that will be considered to be evidence of value for money?
6. What are the critical features of the Grade 12 learner support intervention within the KZN PAIP, which should be used as a basis for comparison with other Learner Support interventions?
7. What financial reporting is available and what will this reveal about expenditure to date on the KZN PAIP Grade 12 support?
8. What are the evident trends from district level reports on the KZN PAIP implementation?
9. What are the perceptions of key stakeholders (to be gleaned from stakeholder interviews) in relation to the implementation of the KZN PAIP objective of Grade 12 learner support?
10. What are the school-level experiences of the KZN PAIP implementation for Grade 12 learner support?
11. Is there evidence for improvements in Grade 12 performance in the province as a result of the implementation of the KZN PAIP in relation to learner support?
12. What is the cost of the intervention to date?
13. What recommendations emerge to guide the further implementation of the KZN PAIP Grade 12 Learner Support?

3. Scope of work

The service provider will be expected to cover the following:

Part A

3.1 Services and Programmes

- a) Determine the extent of provision of FET curriculum.
- b) To determine the effectiveness in the implementation of Provincial Academic Improvement Plan for learners in Grade 12 phase.
- c) To evaluate whether interventions have been implemented in the FET phase as specified by the PAIP and how implementations can be strengthened, as well as to pick up on any unintended consequences if there are any.

3.2 Institutional Issues

- a) Examine the human resource structure available to deliver on the Provincial Academic Improvement Plan (services) across the sector and to monitor these services.

3.3 Effectiveness of institutions and inter-sectoral coordination

- a) Assess what the strengths, weaknesses of the current arrangements for management of the Provincial Academic Improvement Plan (service) provision are?

3.4 Impact and cost effectiveness

- a) Determine whether these interventions are adequately supported by government resources.

4. Deliverables

ACTIVITY/ DELIVERABLE	BY WHEN
Proposals received	
Service provider contracted	
Inception report	
Draft report on data analysis	
Interim report on overall evaluation	
Final data analysis report	
Draft overall report	
Final report	
Presentation of report to Senior Management	

The findings would be tabled at a provincial workshop in early May.

a) Competence of the service provider

The service provider must have a track record of success in managing evaluation or research assignments working with national government, including both qualitative and quantitative research assignments.

The team needs to include the people with the following competencies:

- Strong understanding at a deep level of international experience of different FET phase paradigms.
- Good understanding of the operation of FET curriculum including the social, educational and health perspectives
- Strong expertise of qualitative data analysis, to generate data on impact and cost effectiveness
- Strong understanding of the education system.

b) Skills and Knowledge Required

Though the contract will be awarded to a consultant and or an institution, experts in areas relevant to implementation evaluation should be sub-contracted by the appointed consultant and or institution. It should be noted that the consultant must provide a portfolio of the skills and experience of the sub-contracted individuals/ company in their proposal to the Department that will demonstrate their expertise, especially in the Education Sector.

Specific skills that are required in the team include:

- Proof of previous experience in conducting research and/or evaluation works in the Education Sector (e.g. the extract of report, letter of references over previous work, etc.)
- Proven knowledge of legislative frameworks, relevant inter-sectoral plans, as well as Education Sector policies and programmes.
- Experience and level of skills of the portfolio of individuals (experts) that the consultant or an institution would sub-contract/ approach as required.
- Demonstrable experience in using datasets such as anthropometric data and methodologies for evaluations.
- An in-depth understanding of the Education Sector, policies and legislation as far as it pertains to Grade 12.

- An in-depth understanding of the socio-economic context of learners in the FET phase in South Africa and the effects of inequity.

5. Duration of Evaluation

Duration of the evaluation is six months.

6. Funding

Funding will be provided by the Department of Education.

7. Selection criteria

- i) The selection criteria will be based on the table below.

CRITERION	MAXIMUM TO BE AWARDED	SCORING	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
1. Functionality	25		
1.1 Methodology	(5)	5 Points for detailed proposal	A written proposal outlining: -the understanding of the scope of Work -the approach to the assignment and -methodology to be used in conducting the factual finding report
1.2 Company Experience	(10)	2 points for each successfully completed assignment of a similar nature in the past 3 year	Completion of Annexure listing: -Client Name -Date of completion of assignment -Value of assignment -Time taken for completion -Client contact name and details
1.3 Project Leader	(5)	2 points for appropriate qualification 1 point per successfully managed and completed project	CV of project leader with -certified copy of qualification -completion of experience annexure as in 1.2 above
1.4 Time to completion	(5)	5 points for completion by 31 March 2023	Detailed work plan (Gantt chart) Outlining phases and time to completion

8. Payment Schedule

Stage	% of payment due
Inception report accepted	10%
Final data analysis report	20%
Interim report	30%
Final report	20%
Final combined report	10%
Presentation of final report to Senior Management	10%

Surname and initials of Representative

Date

Signature

Bidder's Name

Annexure B**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT (ECD)****1. Background**

White paper 5 of 2000 set specific targets with regard to five-year olds that were supposed to be in Grade R by 2014. It should be noted that this is a framework with various targets for the provision of ECD services and programmes to children aged birth to 5 years. KZNDOE reached and exceeded this target, as 93 per cent of five-year olds were in Grade R classes by 2014, however, the challenge now is to improve the quality of education that is offered. An evaluation of the quality of education offered in Grade R becomes crucial if we are to align our efforts to the theory of Change behind Grade R which premises the idea that ECD lays a foundation for cognitive functioning, behavioural, social and self-regulatory capacities, and physical health. It is better and cheaper to intervene early.

Importance of the evaluation

ECD is fundamental to the implementation of MTSF outcome which focuses on improved School Readiness of Children. This evaluation will be a formative evaluation aimed at uncovering implementation challenges and highlighting good practice with a view to learning. It is aimed at improving the implementation of the Grade R curriculum. It could also lead to the strengthening of Grade R (CAPS) in support of effective implementation.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

To evaluate whether the Grade R curriculum has been implemented as specified in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) and how implementation can be strengthened. It will include the extent to which various programmes and policy instruments have worked and/or not worked and why, with the recommendations for policy or programme change and improvement in the provision of ECD services.

The service provider will be sought in this regard to conduct full evaluation.

Key questions to be addressed/ scope of evaluation

14. Is there evidence of the extent to which the Gr R curriculum has been implemented?
15. Are Grade R teachers/ practitioners able & motivated to implement the curriculum according to CAPS?
16. Are the mechanisms to support Grade R (CAPS) implementation working?
17. Are the Grade R (CAPS) documents and the systems for implementing it relevant and appropriate for the context it operates?
18. How should Grade R (CAPS) documents and the systems for implementing it be strengthened?
19. What are the specific gaps in the provision and capacity of ECD Practitioners?
20. Are human resources available to deliver on ECD services across the sector and to monitor these services?

3. Scope of work

The service provider will be expected to cover the following:

Part A

3.1 Services and Programmes

- d) Determine the extent of provision of ECD services for various age, gender, racial and income groups; define reasons, opportunities and implications for policy review. What is the core package of services provided to various groups as indicated above? Instruments to be reviewed should include but not limited to the ECD per learner subsidy, Child Support Grant, Funding for public school Grade R.
- e) Determine the extent to which various components of ECD are planned and executed in a sequential manner.
- f) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches.
- g) Identify which instruments are not in place and why? e.g. Infrastructure, remuneration of caregivers, etc.

3.2 Institutional Issues

- b) Examine the human resource structure available to deliver on ECD services across the sector and to monitor these services.

3.3 Effectiveness of institutions and inter-sectoral coordination

- b) Assess what the strengths, weaknesses of the current arrangements for management of ECD service provision are?

3.4 Impact and cost effectiveness

- b) Determine whether these interventions are adequately supported by government resources.

4. Deliverables (Service Provider)

Activity/ deliverable	By when
Proposals received	
Service provider contracted	
Inception report	
Draft report on data analysis	
Interim report on overall evaluation	
Final data analysis report	
Draft overall report	
Final report	

4.1 Competence of the service provider

The service provider must have a track record of success in managing evaluation or research assignments working with national government, including both qualitative and quantitative research assignments.

The team needs to include the people with the following competencies:

- Strong understanding at a deep level of international experience of different ECD paradigms.
- Good understanding of the operation of ECD (Grade R) including the social, educational and health perspectives.
- Strong expertise of qualitative data analysis, to generate data on impact and cost effectiveness.
- Education and CAPS.
- Grade R curriculum.

4.2 Skills and Knowledge Required

The service provider must provide a portfolio of the skills and experience of the individuals/ company in their proposal to the Department that will demonstrate their expertise, especially in Evaluation and ECD sector.

Specific skills that are required include:

- Proof of previous experience in conducting research and/or evaluation works in the ECD sector (e.g. the extract of report, letter of references over previous work, etc.)
- Proven knowledge of legislative frameworks, relevant inter-sectoral plans, as well as ECD policies and programmes.
- Experience and level of skills of the portfolio of individuals (experts) that the consultant or an institution would sub-contract/ approach as required.
- Demonstrable experience in using datasets and methodologies for evaluations.
- An in-depth understanding of the ECD sector, policies and legislation as far as it pertains to ECD.
- An in-depth understanding of the socio-economic context of children in grade R in South Africa and the effects of inequity particularly on vulnerable children.
- Understanding and knowledge of the public sector.

5. Duration of Evaluation

Duration of the evaluation is six months.

6. Funding

Funding will be provided by the Department of Education.

7. Selection criteria

The criteria for selection will be based on the table below:

CRITERION	MAXIMUM TO BE AWARDED	SCORING	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
1. Functionality	25		
1.1 Methodology	(5)	5 Points for detailed proposal	A written proposal outlining: -the understanding of the scope of Work -the approach to the assignment and -methodology to be used in conducting the factual finding report
1.2 Company Experience	(10)	2 points for each successfully completed assignment of a similar nature in the past 3 years	Completion of listing: -Client Name -Date of completion of assignment -Value of assignment -Time taken for completion -Client contact name and details
1.3 Project Leader	(5)	2 points for appropriate qualification 1 point per successfully managed and completed project	CV of project leader with -certified copy of qualification -completion of experience annexure as in 1.2 above
1.4 Time to completion	(5)	5 points for completion	Detailed work plan - Outlining phases and time to completion

21. Payment Schedule

Stage	% of payment due
Inception report accepted	10%
Final data analysis report	20%
Interim report	30%
Final report	20%
Final combined report	10%
Presentation of final report to Senior Management	10%

Surname and initials of Representative

Date

Signature

Bidder's Name

PRICING SCHEDULE – FIRM PRICES

INVITATION OF COSTED PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION OF: DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN (please refer to terms of reference attached as per Annexure A & B)

Name of bidder.....	Bid number: RQ08/07
Closing Time 11h00	Closing date: 13.03.2023

OFFER TO BE VALID FOR...**90.DAYS** FROM THE CLOSING DATE OF BID.

ITEM NO.	Description	Total item Price
01.	The evaluation of Provincial Academic Improvement Plan (PAIP) SBD1. Annexure A	
	The evaluation of Early Childhood Development (ECD) SBD1. Annexure B	
SUB-TOTAL		
ADD: VAT@ 15%		
GRAND TOTAL (QUOTE PRICE IN RSA CURRENCY WITH ALL APPLICABLE TAXES INCLUDED)		

GRAND TOTAL IN WORDS : _____

Surname and initials of Representative _____

Date _____

Signature _____

Bidder's Name _____

COMPANY OFFICIAL STAMP

BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE

1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

Any person (natural or juristic) may make an offer or offers in terms of this invitation to bid. In line with the principles of transparency, accountability, impartiality, and ethics as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and further expressed in various pieces of legislation, it is required for the bidder to make this declaration in respect of the details required hereunder.

Where a person/s are listed in the Register for Tender Defaulters and / or the List of Restricted Suppliers, that person will automatically be disqualified from the bid process.

2. Bidder's declaration

2.1 Is the bidder, or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest¹ in the enterprise, employed by the state? **YES/NO**

2.1.1 If so, furnish particulars of the names, individual identity numbers, and, if applicable, state employee numbers of sole proprietor/ directors / trustees / shareholders / members/ partners or any person having a controlling interest in the enterprise, in table below.

Full Name	Identity Number	Name of State institution

2.2 Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have a relationship with any person who is employed by the procuring institution? **YES/NO**

2.2.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

2.3 Does the bidder or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest in the enterprise have any interest in any other related enterprise whether or not they are bidding for this contract? **YES/NO**

2.3.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

¹ the power, by one person or a group of persons holding the majority of the equity of an enterprise, alternatively, the person/s having the deciding vote or power to influence or to direct the course and decisions of the enterprise.

3 DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, (name)..... in submitting the accompanying bid, do hereby make the following statements that I certify to be true and complete in every respect:

- 3.1 I have read, and I understand the contents of this disclosure;
- 3.2 I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this disclosure is found not to be true and complete in every respect.
- 3.3 The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor. However, communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium² will not be construed as collusive bidding.
- 3.4 In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications, prices, including methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices, market allocation, the intention or decision to submit or not to submit the bid, bidding with the intention not to win the bid and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
- 3.4 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.
- 3.5 There have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements made by the bidder with any official of the procuring institution in relation to this procurement process prior to and during the bidding process except to provide clarification on the bid submitted where so required by the institution; and the bidder was not involved in the drafting of the specifications or terms of reference for this bid.
- 3.6 I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms of section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED IN PARAGRAPHS 1, 2 and 3 ABOVE IS CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT THE STATE MAY REJECT THE BID OR ACT AGAINST ME IN TERMS OF PARAGRAPH 6 OF PFMA SCM INSTRUCTION 03 OF 2021/22 ON PREVENTING AND COMBATING ABUSE IN THE SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Position

.....
Name of bidder

² Joint venture or Consortium means an association of persons for the purpose of combining their expertise, property, capital, efforts, skill and knowledge in an activity for the execution of a contract.

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2022

This preference form must form part of all tenders invited. It contains general information and serves as a claim form for preference points for specific goals.

NB: BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM, TENDERERS MUST STUDY THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, DEFINITIONS AND DIRECTIVES APPLICABLE IN RESPECT OF THE TENDER AND PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2022

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

1.1 The following preference point systems are applicable to invitations to tender:

- the 80/20 system for requirements with a Rand value of up to R50 000 000 (all applicable taxes included); and
- the 90/10 system for requirements with a Rand value above R50 000 000 (all applicable taxes included).

1.2 **To be completed by the organ of state**

(delete whichever is not applicable for this tender).

- a) The applicable preference point system for this tender is the 90/10 preference point system.
- b) The applicable preference point system for this tender is the 80/20 preference point system.
- c) Either the 90/10 or 80/20 preference point system will be applicable in this tender. The lowest/ highest acceptable tender will be used to determine the accurate system once tenders are received.

1.3 Points for this tender (even in the case of a tender for income-generating contracts) shall be awarded for:

- (a) Price; and
- (b) Specific Goals.

1.4 **To be completed by the organ of state:**

The maximum points for this tender are allocated as follows:

	POINTS
PRICE	80
SPECIFIC GOALS	20
Total points for Price and SPECIFIC GOALS	100

- 1.5 Failure on the part of a tenderer to submit proof or documentation required in terms of this tender to claim points for specific goals with the tender, will be interpreted to mean that preference points for specific goals are not claimed.
- 1.6 The organ of state reserves the right to require of a tenderer, either before a tender is adjudicated or at any time subsequently, to substantiate any claim in regard to preferences, in any manner required by the organ of state.

2. DEFINITIONS

- (a) **“tender”** means a written offer in the form determined by an organ of state in response to an invitation to provide goods or services through price quotations, competitive tendering process or any other method envisaged in legislation;
- (b) **“price”** means an amount of money tendered for goods or services, and includes all applicable taxes less all unconditional discounts;
- (c) **“rand value”** means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand, calculated at the time of bid invitation, and includes all applicable taxes;
- (d) **“tender for income-generating contracts”** means a written offer in the form determined by an organ of state in response to an invitation for the origination of income-generating contracts through any method envisaged in legislation that will result in a legal agreement between the organ of state and a third party that produces revenue for the organ of state, and includes, but is not limited to, leasing and disposal of assets and concession contracts, excluding direct sales and disposal of assets through public auctions; and
- (e) **“the Act”** means the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act, 2000 (Act No. 5 of 2000).

3. FORMULAE FOR PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

3.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

3.1.1 THE 80/20 OR 90/10 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS

A maximum of 80 or 90 points is allocated for price on the following basis:

80/20 or 90/10

$$Ps = 80 \left(1 - \frac{Pt - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right) \text{ or } Ps = 90 \left(1 - \frac{Pt - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right)$$

Where

Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

Pt = Price of tender under consideration

Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

3.2. FORMULAE FOR DISPOSAL OR LEASING OF STATE ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING PROCUREMENT

3.2.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

A maximum of 80 or 90 points is allocated for price on the following basis:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 80/20 & \text{or} & 90/10 \\ P_s = 80 \left(1 + \frac{P_t - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right) & \text{or} & P_s = 90 \left(1 + \frac{P_t - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right) \end{array}$$

Where

- P_s = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
 P_t = Price of tender under consideration
 P_{max} = Price of highest acceptable tender

4. POINTS AWARDED FOR SPECIFIC GOALS

- 4.1. In terms of Regulation 4(2); 5(2); 6(2) and 7(2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points must be awarded for specific goals stated in the tender. For the purposes of this tender the tenderer will be allocated points based on the goals stated in table 1 below as may be supported by proof/ documentation stated in the conditions of this tender:
- 4.2. In cases where organs of state intend to use Regulation 3(2) of the Regulations, which states that, if it is unclear whether the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system applies, an organ of state must, in the tender documents, stipulate in the case of—
- (a) an invitation for tender for income-generating contracts, that either the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system will apply and that the highest acceptable tender will be used to determine the applicable preference point system; or
 - (b) any other invitation for tender, that either the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system will apply and that the lowest acceptable tender will be used to determine the applicable preference point system,

then the organ of state must indicate the points allocated for specific goals for both the 90/10 and 80/20 preference point system.

Table 1: Specific goals for the tender and points claimed are indicated per the table below.

(Note to organs of state: Where either the 90/10 or 80/20 preference point system is applicable, corresponding points must also be indicated as such.)

Note to tenderers: The tenderer must indicate how they claim points for each preference point system.)

Departmental Specific Goals	Departmental Specific Goals Narrative	Number of Points (90/10 System)	Number of Points (80/20 System)
Race (HDP)	Black Equity Ownership – 100% (Africans, Coloureds and Indians)	4	10
Gender (HDP)	Female Equity Ownership (>51%)	3	5
Disability (HDP)	In respect of a person, a permanent impairment of a physical, intellectual or sensory function. NB: Medical Certificate to be submitted as a proof to Disability	2	4
Youth	Youth Equity Ownership - (>51%)	1	1

DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM

4.3. Name of company/firm.....

4.4. Company registration number:

4.5. TYPE OF COMPANY/ FIRM

Partnership/Joint Venture / Consortium

One-person business/sole propriety

Close corporation

Public Company

Personal Liability Company

(Pty) Limited

Non-Profit Company

State Owned Company

[TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

4.6. I, the undersigned, who is duly authorised to do so on behalf of the company/firm, certify that the points claimed, based on the specific goals as advised in the tender, qualifies the company/ firm for the preference(s) shown and I acknowledge that:

- i) The information furnished is true and correct;
- ii) The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form;
- iii) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraphs 1.4 and 4.2, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to

the satisfaction of the organ of state that the claims are correct;

iv) If the specific goals have been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the organ of state may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –

- (a) disqualify the person from the tendering process;
- (b) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person's conduct;
- (c) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;
- (d) recommend that the tenderer or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, be restricted from obtaining business from any organ of state for a period not exceeding 10 years, after the *audi alteram partem* (hear the other side) rule has been applied; and
- (e) forward the matter for criminal prosecution, if deemed necessary.

.....	
SIGNATURE(S) OF TENDERER(S)	
SURNAME AND NAME:
DATE:
ADDRESS:

