

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION

Reference No:

You are hereby requested to submit a quotation in respect of goods and services as per **Annexure A**, and/or attached Specification/Terms of Reference.

SUPPLIER DETAILS					
Name of supplier					
Contact person					
Fax number					
Contact number					
BUSINESS CLASSIFICATION					
Turn over (TICK appropriate box below) Please note that this information is compulsory and must therefore be provided. If uncertain use the attached schedule for guidance					
Exempted Micro-Enterprises (EMEs) R0.00 to R10m				Qualifying Small Enterprises (QSE)	Large Company
Small	Micro	Medium	Cooperative	>R10m <R50m	>R50 million
ENQUIRIES AND SUBMISSION DETAILS					
Contact person		Nhlakanipho Msane			
e-mail address		DSBDEExternalRFQ@dsbd.gov.za			
Telephone number		060 981 0616			
Issue/Request date		19 NOVEMBER 2025			
Closing date and time		28 NOVEMBER 2025 @ 12H00			
Terms and Conditions					
#	REQUIREMENTS				COMMENTS
1	Quotations should be dated.				
2	Quotations should be valid for 30 days unless indicated otherwise.				
3	Does it comply with cost containment (Yes or No)				
3	All prices quoted must be VAT inclusive, if no indication is indicated prices will be evaluated as inclusive.				
4	Should you not be registered for VAT it should be clearly indicated on the quotation.				
5	Please indicate the delivery period and confirm whether the delivery period is firm.				
6	Please indicate whether the prices quoted are firm for the duration of the validity period of the quotation.				
7	Please indicate whether the quotation is strictly to specification and if not state deviations and reasons for deviating from the requested specifications.				
8	This quotation is subject to the Department of Small Business Development's general conditions of contract unless otherwise stated by the supplier.				
9	Quotations should be on the service provider's letter head.				
10	Failure to submit quotation on the closing date and time with all supporting documents MAY invalidate your quotation				

Please note: Quotations with an amount value of R2 000.00 and above but not exceeding R999 999.99 80/20 preference point system shall be applied where 80 points will be allocated towards price and 20 points allocated towards specific goals, Size of Enterprise, Spatial (rural/ Township/ City) and Youth.

ANNEXURE A

REQUIREMENTS LIST			
Item No	No of units	Item description	Value per item
1	1	THE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (DSBD) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FROM EXPERIENCED SERVICE PROVIDERS TO CONDUCT AN IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES EVALUATION OF THE INFORMAL AND MICRO ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IMEDP)	
Compulsory documents to be returned.		(a) Fully completed Standard Bidding Documents; SBD 4 and 6.1 (b) Points for tender shall be awarded for Price and B-BBEE, SMMEs, Spatial (rural/ Township/ City) and Youth. To claim points following should be provided. i. For B-BBEE require a Certified copy of BEE Certificate/or Affidavit, ii. A Confirmation of SMMEs, take note of the above table (business classification) iii. For Spatial (Rural/ Township/ City) a Certified copy of your proof of residence 6 months	

SCHEDULE 1

The new National Small Enterprise Act thresholds for defining enterprise size classes by sector, using two proxies

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Sectors or sub-sectors in accordance with the Standard Industrial	Size or class of enterprise	Total full-time equivalent of paid employees	Total annual turnover
Agriculture	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 35,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 17,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 7,0 million

Mining and Quarrying	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 210,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 50,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 15,0 million
Manufacturing	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 170,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 50,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 10,0 million
Electricity, Gas and Water	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 180,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 60,0 million
	Micro	0- 10	≤ 10,0 million
Construction	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 170,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 75,0 million
	Micro	0- 10	≤ 10,0 million
Retail, motor trade and repair services.	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 80,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 25,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 7,5 million
Wholesale	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 220,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 80,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 20,0 million
Catering, Accommodation and other Trade	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 40,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 15,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 5,0 million
Transport, Storage and Communications	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 140,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 45,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 7,5 million
Finance and Business Services	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 85,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 35,0 million
	Micro	0- 10	≤ 7,5 million
Community, Social and Personal Services	Medium	51 - 250	≤ 70,0 million
	Small	11- 50	≤ 22,0 million
	Micro	0 – 10	≤ 5,0 million

THE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (DSBD) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FROM EXPERIENCED SERVICE PROVIDERS TO CONDUCT AN IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES EVALUATION OF THE INFORMAL AND MICRO ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IMEDP)

Date issued : 19 November 2025

Closing date and time : 28 November 2025 @12H00

Request Validity Period: 90 days

Submission of proposals: Supply Chain Management
dsbdtenders@dsbd.gov.za

1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The Department of Small Business Development (DSBD) was established in 2014 with the responsibility to facilitate development and growth of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise MSMEs. This mandate includes the development of policies and interventions for the enterprise development sector. In 2014, DSBD then still under Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (DTIC) launched the National Informal Business Upliftment Strategy in South Africa (NIBUS). This strategy was developed to address policy and programmatic gaps in the informal economy. It is designed to improve the conditions and operations of informal businesses, particularly those owned by women, youth and people with disabilities.

In 2015, DSBD developed the Informal and Micro Enterprise Development Programme (IMEDP) as one of the programmes implemented under NIBUS. IMEDP was designed to close the development gap at the lowest end of the MSMEs development landscape caused by the lack of focus and support for informal businesses¹. The objective of IMEDP is to support informal and micro enterprises with equipment and machinery. It was first rolled out as a pilot project named Informal Traders Upliftment Project (ITUP) aimed at developing the capacity of informal traders/retailers. The pilot project was a 50/50 partnership between DSBD and the Wholesale and Retail Sector Education and Training Authority (W&R SETA).

IMEDP as an instrument of NIBUS is aimed at empowering and developing informal traders with adequate skills and equipment to manage their businesses. IMEDP is administered as 100% grant offered to informal and micro enterprises. The programme has Guidelines and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) which assist in the value chain of applications and processing of claims. IMEDP has been in implementation since years since 2015 in all nine provinces, supporting over 13 700 beneficiaries over the period 2018 to 2024.

DSBD is commissioning an evaluation of IMEDP with a need to understand how the programme performed (outcomes against stated objectives) from 2019 to 2024 and how it can be improved for the future implementation.

1.1. The unit of Analysis (Informal and Micro Enterprise Development Programme)

The Informal and Micro Enterprise Development Programme (IMEDP) was established in 2015 with the primary objectives as follows:

- Provide developmental support to informal and micro businesses that are operating in preferably townships and rural areas of South Africa and owned by historically disadvantaged individuals (which implies being an indigenous citizen of the country).

¹ Informal and Micro Enterprise Development Programme (IMEDP) Guidelines

- Develop and strengthen the capacity of credible informal and/or micro enterprises to be sustainable through the provision of access to information, business development support services, business infrastructure (machinery, tools, equipment) and (excluding input/raw materials, stock).

2. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness and sustainability of the IMEDP between the period 2019 to 2024. Furthermore, to explore the extent to which the intended objectives have been achieved. The evaluation should provide insights for learning and offer recommendations to improve the programme or/ and future interventions.

In line with the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation's (DPME) Gender Responsive Guideline 2021², National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) 2019³, and Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEA) 2019⁴, the Informal and Micro Enterprise Development Programme (IMEDP) Programme evaluation will adopt a Gender-Responsive Evaluation (GRE) approach as a core principle to ensure that the programme is assessed through a gender-equity lens.

Given South Africa's historical, socio-economic, and cultural context, this approach will examine the differential impacts of IMEDP on women, men, and gender-diverse entrepreneurs, particularly those operating in townships and rural areas. Collecting and analysing gender-disaggregated data and engaging with marginalised groups will help uncover structural barriers faced by women, youth, and persons with disabilities (PWDs) in accessing support, finance, and opportunities within the programme.

3. THE FOCUS OF EVALUATION WHICH THE DSBG INTENDS TO COVER IN THE EVALUATION

Key evaluation approach and questions to be addressed:

Relevance

- 3.1. Was a needs assessment/analysis conducted prior to the programme design?
- 3.2. Is the programme been implemented according to its design?
- 3.3. How relevant is the intervention to the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders?
- 3.4. To what extent do the intervention's objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, and institutional needs and priorities, such as the National Development Plan (NDP) and Medium-Term Development Plan (MTDP)?

² Gender Responsive Guideline (2021)

³ National Evaluation Policy Framework (2019)

⁴ Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (2019)

Coherence

3.5. To what extent is the programme compatible with other interventions within the department?

Effectiveness

3.6. Is the programme been implemented as planned?

3.7. To what extent have programme objectives been met?

3.8. How well did the programme work?

3.9. To what extent have IMEDP programme's interventions contributed to promoting gender equality that benefits women, men, and other vulnerable groups?

3.10. Have different population groups (who) or geographic locations (where) been able to participate in the programme appropriately and fairly?

3.11. Whose interests are prioritised, and whose are neglected? What mitigations are in place to counter inequities?

3.12. During the period under review has there been gaps identified in implementation of the programme, if so, how were they addressed?

Sustainability

3.13. How sustainable are the outcomes achieved?

3.14. How could the invention be strengthened in future?

Point of Emphasis

Please note that the above questions are key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) proposed for the evaluation. The appointed service provider will need to develop sub-questions that align with these KEQs in order to completely address the evaluation's objectives and purpose.

4. INTENDED USERS AND STAKEHOLDERS OF THE EVALUATION.

The following table depicts potential users of the evaluation results and how they will/may use the information:

Table 1: Outcome and Implementation Evaluation of IMEDP

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How will they use it?
1. DSBD	• Understand how IMEDP is working and suggestions for improving effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of this programme. • To strengthen the oversight for the implementing agency. • Strengthening Monitoring and Accountability

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How will they use it?
	• Informed decision-making on resource allocation. • Enhance stakeholder engagement and value of partnerships.
2. Small Enterprise Development and Finance Agency (SEDFA)	• Understand how IMEDP is working and suggestions for improving effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of this programme. • Strengthen its role as an implementing partner and improve the operational effectiveness of its support to informal enterprises. • The evaluation will provide SEDFA with evidence-based insights into the performance of the programme, highlighting what is working well and where adjustments are needed. This will enable SEDFA to refine its implementation approaches, improve coordination with stakeholders, and enhance service delivery to beneficiaries.
3. Provincial Economic Development Departments	• Ensure strategic alignment and improve coordination. • To enhance the planning, coordination, and implementation of support services for small enterprises. • Inform region-specific interventions, ensuring that support is tailored to the unique needs of local enterprises, including those in under-resourced or rural areas. • To ensure maximum impact of interventions to MSMEs.
4. Informal and Micro Business Associations/Forums	• Improved services to members • To understand the extent to which the outcomes benefit the MSMEs.
5. Wholesale and Retail Sector Education and Training Authority (W&R SETA)	• Improved services to members • To understand the value of partnerships in support to MSMEs.
6. Small Enterprise Practitioners	• Understanding of how programmes are utilised • Use of evaluation findings to inform the design of programmes in future.

5. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

- 5.1.** The evaluation will cover the IMEDP implementation for six (6) years from 2019 to 2024. The evaluation team will undertake a comprehensive assessment of the intervention's progress and challenges, and examine activities implemented to determine variations in effectiveness across different provinces. All stakeholders must be engaged as their perspectives will be critical in understanding the programme's relevance, coherence, effectiveness, and sustainability.
- 5.2.** This evaluation will focus on the IMEDP and examine the programme guideline and standard operating procedures, including implementation arrangements between various partners/parties, looking at recruitment, handling of and processing of applications, and ultimately disbursement of support.
- 5.3. Geographic coverage:** The evaluation will cover the programme at a provincial and district level focusing areas where the programme was implemented as informed by the available data. A nationally representative sample of the beneficiaries being supported under IMEDP (in scope), disaggregated by province, district and sectors, gender (women, youth and people living with disabilities). The sample frame will be 7183 (supported), from which a minimum representative sample of 365 will be selected.

5.4. Within the scope:

The evaluation is anchored on the primary objectives of IMEDP, namely:

- Provide developmental support to informal and micro businesses that are operating in preferably townships and rural areas of South Africa and owned by historically disadvantaged individuals (which implies being an indigenous citizen of the country).
- Develop and strengthen the capacity of credible informal and/or micro enterprises to be sustainable through the provision of access to information, business development support services, business infrastructure (machinery, tools, equipment) and (excluding input/raw materials, stock).

The service provider will also need to consider and refer to the following strategies and reports that are core to the formulation and implementation of IMEDP:

- National Informal Business Upliftment Strategy South Africa (NIBUS)
- Informal Traders Upliftment Project (ITUP) Report.

5.5. Outside scope

The evaluation will not focus on the Shared Economic Infrastructure Facilities programme which is also key component of a NIBUS.

6. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The service provider is expected to propose relevant evaluation methods to respond to the key evaluation questions in **section 3** above. The evaluation is expected to employ a mixed-methods approach, integrating qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques to ensure a comprehensive assessment. The evaluation process will require a participatory approach whereby the work engages all key stakeholders, DSBD, agency, beneficiaries and all other relevant stakeholders as listed in table 1 above.

The methodology must include amongst others, the following:

Document Review and literature review

Review relevant Legislative, policy and strategic documents addressing government economic objectives for the period under review. The service provider is expected to analyse related documentation to determine the linkage, overlaps and gaps and how implementation can be improved moving forward. Key to document analysis is to determine whether IMEDP guidelines were developed in alignment with its NIBUS strategy or vice versa.

Refinement of the Theory Change and Logical Framework of the IMEDP

The service provider is expected to assess and refine the existing Theory of Change (ToC) and the logical framework (LO) of the IMEDP. A final version of the ToC and LO must be submitted at the end of this evaluation. This ToC and LO will serve as a guiding document for the programme's implementation and monitoring. The recommendations provided should be specific, achievable, and grounded in practical considerations because they will serve as a roadmap for developing an improvement plan following the evaluation.

Interviews of key stakeholders

The service provider is expected to conduct interviews with key stakeholders, including programme managers at DSBD and other individuals critical to the implementation of the IMEDP under its institutional arrangements. In addition, a survey will be administered both online and in-person, targeting all sampled MSMEs. The evaluation must adhere to ethical guidelines, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and cultural sensitivity in data collection and reporting.

Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

Different data collection methods should be utilised to enable mixed methods approaches that effectively answer the KEQs. The sampling methods and approaches must be justified, ensuring a representative sample and the use of standard sampling techniques aligned with the evaluation framework's logic and design. Additionally, data and information should be represented at national, provincial, district, and enterprise level. Cross-cutting issues, including gender, women, youth, and people with disabilities, should be captured and measured as part of the evaluation process. Accordingly, data should be disaggregated to reflect strategic equity considerations, such as

programme uptake and trends impacting these groups, thereby ensuring a comprehensive and inclusive assessment

Point of Emphasis

Data limitations need to be addressed through the use of mixed methods as far as possible or stated and captured as part of the overall design of the evaluation. Any assumptions and trade-offs need to be stated and agreed upon.

7. EVALUATION PLAN

Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation.

7.1. The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- 7.1.1. The Literature and Document Review and Analysis Report of the IMEDP Programme systematically examine key sources to provide context, assess policy alignment, and inform the evaluation framework. This should include reviewing national development plans, MSME policies, and DSBD strategies to ensure alignment with broader government priorities; analysing programme design documents such as the National Informal Business Upliftment Strategy (NIBUS), IMEDP Guideline; and examining monitoring and evaluation reports, financial records, and operational data to measure the programme's performance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability.
- 7.1.2. Evaluation framework including report structure, detailed methodology, content structure for the final report final data collection instruments and other tools designed to measure how the Theory of Change is working.
- 7.1.3. One-day workshop to discuss the report structure, evaluation matrix, analytical, final data collection instruments and other tools.
- 7.1.4. A Theory of Change (ToC) workshop with stakeholders to discuss, assess and refine a theory of change for the IMEDP to guide the evaluation. An in-person or virtual Theory of Change (ToC) workshop is a critical component of the evaluation process to foster collaborative engagements among key stakeholders, including programme managers, implementers, and beneficiaries. This setting allows for real-time dialogue, clarification of assumptions, and consensus-building around the programme's intended outcomes, causal pathways, and contextual factors. The workshop will help surface implicit theories, align perspectives, and validate or refine the existing ToC based on practical experiences and insights. Ultimately, it will strengthen the rigour and relevance of the evaluation framework, ensuring that the evaluation is grounded in a shared understanding of the programme logic.

- 7.1.5. Fieldwork/ data collection progress reports.
- 7.1.6. Draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/5/25 format (*note: there may be 2 versions after comments*).
- 7.1.7. A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report; (*note: this may be held to discuss initial findings and recommendations before the 2nd version draft report is produced*)
- 7.1.8. The final evaluation report, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic.
- 7.1.9. A closed-out workshop to receive the final evaluation report
- 7.1.10. Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected. This will remain the property of DSBD.
- 7.1.11. A PowerPoint or audio-visual presentation of the results and other presentations as required.

7. MILESTONES

The duration of the evaluation is for **four (4) months** with implementation expected to start in December 2025 and must be completed by 31 March 2026. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables as reflected on **table 2** below.

Table 2: Outline project plan and payment schedule

Deliverables	Expected milestones	% Payment
Sign Service Level Agreement (SLA) ⁵		
Submission of draft data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools to test out how the theory of change is working.	Dec 2025	25%
One-day (virtual) workshop to discuss and refine the overarching Theory of Change for the suite of draft data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools to test out how the theory of change is working		
Approval of final data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools		
Revised literature review and document analysis (1 st draft report)		

⁵ The service provider is required to note that no work will commence before the signing of the SLA and subsequent issuing of the Purchase Order (PO).

Deliverables	Expected milestones	% Payment
Fieldwork data collection progress reports	Jan- Feb 2026	30%
2 nd draft evaluation report for review. This includes proposed changes to the intervention design.		
Validation workshop with relevant stakeholders to discuss the draft report		
Revised Draft evaluation report full and 1/5/25 summaries	March 2026	25%
Consolidated comments/ inputs from the evaluation steering committee		
Final Evaluation Report, Version 1 Submitted		
Comments/ inputs from the evaluation steering committee on Final Report	March 2026	20%
Final report draft, version 2 Submitted		
Approval of the Report by the Steering Committee		
Close-Out Report:		
PowerPoint Presentation of the Report at DSBD top management (EXCO) and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts).		

7.1. Pricing requirements

The payment will be made as per the payment schedule above. The service provider is requested to provide an all-inclusive cost for the project. Daily rates with anticipated days per team member/expert need to be provided. Any anticipated travel and disbursements also need to be detailed and should form part of the overall project cost.

The project will be awarded on the total project cost over the project period and not based on hourly or daily rates. The service provider will need to ensure the delivery of the project deliverables and outcomes within the required time stipulated in this Terms of reference.

Point of Emphasis

All prices must be inclusive of VAT. Price escalations, and the conditions of escalation should be indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in these terms of reference.

8. EVALUATION TEAM

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. The team must include an evaluation specialist with proven experience and relevant qualifications, at least a master's degree or higher in related field is preferred.

Team roles and responsibilities Role(s)	Requirements	Responsibilities
Evaluation Specialist	Must have a minimum of five years of experience in evaluation and independently led three national evaluations in which one is implementation and or outcome evaluation. Minimum: Honours Degree in Social Science or related i.e. Research, Sociology and Demography plus Post-Graduate Diploma in M&E. A Masters and or Doctorate qualification in M&E will be an Advantage. Technical Experience Experience with qualitative and quantitative research methods. Experience in statistical analysis and handling large datasets using software like SPSS Experience in qualitative analysis ATLAS.ti, NVivo, MAXQDA or other Qualitative Data Analysis Software,	Bring specialist knowledge in the Implementation and outcome evaluation methodology.
Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Sector Specialist	Must have ten years' experience in MSME development and support and must have designed or implemented minimum of three MSME interventions. A relevant Postgraduate in Entrepreneurship development and or Development studies majoring in Economics.	Bring in-depth knowledge and understanding of the enterprise development in particular with regard to MSME development and or implementation support and be able to bring this insight to ensure that the richness of the programme is explored, and meaningful recommendations derived. Understand the relevant sector/intervention and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments

9. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MANAGING THE EVALUATION.

I. Role of steering committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising DSBD, provincial institution and other stakeholders which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables.

II. Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report on evaluation process and commissioning is Ms Patricia Langa, Director: Sector Wide Monitoring and Evaluation, email address (PLanga@dsbd.gov.za, Tel: 0661109877.

10. STRUCTURE AND CONTENTS OF PROPOSAL TO BE SUBMITTED

10.1. Structure and contents of the proposal

A structure and contents of a proposal required from the service provider is shown in **Box 1** below.

Box 1. Structure of a proposal

The proposal must provide the following details as outlined below. Failure to provide this will lead to disqualification.

1. Approach, design, and methodology for the evaluation (e.g., literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of evaluation questions suggested, process elements)
2. Activity-based evaluation plans (including effort for different team member/s per activity and time frame linked to activities it is particularly important that effort levels for key national and international resources are clear)
3. Detailed activity-based budgets (in South African Rand, including VAT what about disbursement)
4. Competence (**must include list of related projects undertaken** (independently managed/led) by the main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, when. This **must include** (2) two contactable references for the evaluations presented as **Evidence of previous bid in similar projects and submitted.**
5. Team (team members, roles, and level of effort for each member of the team)
6. Capacity building plan (skills transfer) for emerging evaluators within DSBD
7. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

Attachments

MUST: Examples of reports of two evaluation (implementation and or Outcomes) undertaken taken in accordance with the national evaluation systems

Letter from departments or organisations with a reference for work undertaken indicating the work carried out, date, value and whether the work was satisfactory. This should include contact details for follow up.

CVs of key personnel

Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

10.2. Information for service providers

Proposal must be submitted on with electronic and 4 hard copies.

11. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

11.1. Phase 1: Administrative compliance

Supply Chain Management will conduct a preliminary compliance evaluation of all proposals and only those that have complied in terms of procurement requirements (i.e. registered on CSD, tax complaint and any other requirement that would have been indicated in the bid document).

11.2. Phase 2: Functional evaluation

The second phase will be the evaluation to determine the capability of the service provider to deliver on the specified requirements. The following key score shall be applied for the evaluation on functionality. Only service providers that score 70% and above on functionality will go through to Phase 3.

Measurement Matrix for Proposal

Scoring system					
0	1	2	3	4	5
Does not comply with the requirements	Poor (Significantly below requirements)	Average (below requirements)	Good (Satisfactory and meets the requirements)	Very Good (Above average compliance to the requirements)	Excellent (Exceeds the functionality requirements)

No.	Domain/ Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score out of 5	Weighing
1.	Understanding of the Terms of Reference (TORS)	The proposal must directly address the Terms of Reference (TORs) by clearly outlining the proposed approach, design, and methodology for this evaluation. Provides a well-reasoned justification for the selected study design and methods, demonstrating how they are appropriate for answering the key evaluation questions. Reflects a sound understanding of the programme context, ensure methodological rigour, and how the chosen approach will generate credible, relevant, and actionable findings. Clearly articulate the project requirements and scope of work, presenting a comprehensive and logical methodology, design, and approach. All proposed activities, milestones, and timeframes are clearly defined and well-structured. The study design is thoroughly justified, demonstrating its relevance and suitability to the objectives of the evaluation. The methodology is responsive to the Terms of Reference and aligned with the scope of work, ensuring the evaluation yields meaningful, credible, and actionable insights. 0 - Unacceptable (The proposal does not address the ToR requirements at all) 1 - Poor (The proposal poorly addressed the ToR requirements and stipulated one of the key elements) 2- Average (The proposal addressed some of the ToR requirements and stipulated two of the key elements) 3- Good (The proposal addressed all the ToR requirements (The approach, design, methodology for the evaluation is all included Clear justification of the rationale behind the study design, methodology and related approaches) 4- Very good (In addition to 3, shortcomings / limitation associated with the overall approach to be followed in the study identified and the mitigation strategies articulated) 5- Excellent (In addition to 4, there is demonstration of innovative and originality of methodology and approach to addressing the overall study requirements which are likely to increase the use)	30	

No.	Domain/ Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score out of 5	Weighing
2	Evaluation Leadership	Effectively managing the project and team to ensure successful completion, while employing facilitation and learning approaches that foster stakeholder commitment and ownership. This will be particularly important in engaging the following three key role players, ensuring their active participation, alignment with project objectives, and contribution to meaningful outcomes		
21.	Evaluation Specialist	The Evaluation Specialist have proven experience in conducting various types of evaluations, including impact evaluations. The CV includes specific examples of previous evaluations undertaken, detailing the scope, methodologies used, and outcomes achieved. Additionally, at least two verifiable references from these evaluations are provided to demonstrate the specialist's competence, credibility, and track record in delivering high-quality, evidence-based evaluation work. 0-Unacceptable (no experience and never independently led national evaluation and or research project) 1-Poor (three years' experience in evaluation and independently led one national evaluation) 2-Average (Five years' experience in evaluation and independently led two national evaluations but not impact evaluation) 3-Good (five years' experience in evaluation and independently led three national evaluations in which one is impact evaluation and relevant post-graduate qualifications) 4-Very Good (Six to ten years' experience in evaluation and independently led six national evaluations in which two are impact evaluations and relevant post-graduate qualifications) 5. Excellent (eleven and plus experience years in evaluation, independently led eight national evaluations in which three are impact evaluations and relevant master's qualifications)		20
3	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Sector Specialist	Bring in-depth knowledge and understanding of enterprise development, particularly in relation to MSME development, support, and implementation.		10

No.	Domain/ Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score out of 5	Weighing
		A strong understanding of the relevant sector (MSME) or intervention (IMEDP), as well as the associated government systems, to effectively contextualise the evaluation. This includes the ability to relate the evaluation findings to the current political, policy, and governance environments, ensuring that the recommendations are realistic, aligned with government priorities, and feasible within existing institutional frameworks. 0-Unacceptable (no experience and relevant qualifications and no intervention designed/implemented) 1-Poor (less than five years' experience in enterprise development and with one MSMEs intervention designed or implemented) 2-Average (six to nine years' experience in enterprise development, relevant experience and two MSMEs intervention designed or implemented) 3-Good (Ten years' experience in enterprise development, relevant experience and three MSMEs intervention designed or implemented, relevant postgraduate in entrepreneurship development and or development studies majoring in Economics. 4-Very Good (eleven to fifteen years of experience in enterprise development, four interventions designed / implemented and relevant Postgraduate in entrepreneurship development and or development studies majoring in Economics) 5. Excellent (sixteen plus years of experience in enterprise development, five interventions designed / implemented and relevant Postgraduate in entrepreneurship development and or development studies majoring in Economics)		
4.	Implementation of the evaluation			
4.1	Project Plan	The quality of the activity-based plan is clear and provides a detailed breakdown of activities, ensuring that the efforts required for each consultant per activity is well-defined. The plan specifies the time frame linked to each activity, allowing for effective tracking and management of progress. The level of detail demonstrates a realistic allocation of resources and time, ensuring that the activities are manageable and achievable within the given timeline. The plan reflects the logical sequencing of tasks,		20

No.	Domain/ Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score out of 5	Weighing
		with dependencies between activities clearly identified to ensure a smooth workflow throughout the project. 0- Unacceptable (<i>No Plan</i>) 1- Poor (Project plan did not include milestones) 2-Average (Project plan with clear milestones presented) 3-Good (Project plan, with clear and realistic milestones, meeting timeframes described and an indication of resource allocation) 4 - Very Good (In addition to 3, risks and corrective measures identified) 5 - Excellent (In addition to 4, demonstration of additional information addressing requirements of the study)		
4.2	Building Capacity of Emerging Evaluators within DSBd (Skills Transfer)	Capacity Building for Emerging Evaluators within DSBd: Incorporate an innovative and practical model for building the capacity of emerging evaluators and other staff within the Directorate: Sector-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation. This includes providing hands-on learning opportunities and technical exposure to key aspects of the evaluation process, thereby strengthening internal capacity in monitoring and evaluation practices 0 - Unacceptable (No Plan) 1 - Poor (Capacity building plan did not include technical areas and milestones for execution) 2 - Average (Capacity building plan includes technical areas and milestones for execution clear milestones presented) 3 - Good (Capacity building plan includes technical areas with clear and realistic milestones as well as an indication of resource allocation to emerging evaluators) 4 - Very Good (In addition to 3, innovative / model for effective capacity for emerging measures identified)		10

No.	Domain/ Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score out of 5	Weighing
		5 - Excellent (In addition to 4, presentation of technical tools (data collection and analysis) presented to effect transfer of skills addressing requirements this requirements of the study) Report Writing and Communication (Parameters): Demonstrates the ability to produce clear, concise, and focused evaluation reports that are credible, useful, and actionable. Reports must directly address the key evaluation questions and clearly present the evidence, analysis, and synthesis. Recommendations should be well-grounded in the findings and evaluative interpretations, showing logical progression from data to insight. The reports are structured in a way that highlights how the various components (evidence, analysis, and conclusions) are interlinked, ensuring clarity, coherence, and utility for decision-making by stakeholders. 0- Unacceptable (None of the parameters mentioned above were met and there were severe shortcomings in the evaluation report) 1 - Poor (Most parameters mentioned above were not met and there were major shortcomings in the evaluation report) 2 - Average (More than one parameter mentioned above was unmet with significant shortcomings in the evaluation report) 3 - Good (All parameters mentioned above were fully met with minor shortcomings in the evaluation report) 4 - Very Good (All parameters mentioned above were fully met and there were no shortcomings in the evaluation report) 5- Excellent (in addition to 4, risks discussed in the evaluation report)		10
4.3	Evidence of previous bids in similar projects			
	Total			100

11.3. Phase 3: Price and BEE Contribution status level

Only bidders that score at least 80 points on the above out of 100 points on Functionality will be considered to the next phase, which will determine the bidder (s) to be recommended for approval by the delegated authority. The 80/20 Preference points system will be applied using the below formula to calculate the price:

The following formula will be used to calculate the points for price: Criteria	Points
Price Evaluation $P_s = 80 \left(1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right)$	80

Where,

- P_s = Points scored for the comparative price of a bid under consideration
 P_t = Comparative price of a bid under consideration
 $P_{\min}$ = Comparative price of lowest acceptable bid

In terms of Regulations 4(2); 5(2); 6(2) and 7(2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the Specific goals status level of contribution by the table as set out in the Preference Points Claim Form (SBD 6.1).

Table 1: Specific goals for the tender and points claimed are indicated per the table below. *Note to tenderers: The tenderer must indicate how they claim points for each preference point system.*

The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	Number of points allocated (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
	2	

BEE Compliance Based on Section of the BBBEE Act (Act 53 of 2003 as amended by Act 46 of 2013)	Level 1 = 2 pts Level 2 = 1,75 pts Level 3 = 1,5 pts Level 4 = 1,25 pts Level 5 = 1 pts Level 6 = 0,75 pts Level 7 = 0,5 pts Level 8 = 0,25 pts Non-compliant contributor= 0	
Size of Enterprise (SMMES): MICRO, SMALL, MEDIUM ENTERPRISES	8	
	Micro = 8 Small = 5,6 Medium = 3,2 Large = 0,8	
Spatial (Rural/ Township/ City)	4	
	Rural = 4 Township = 2,4 City = 0,8	
Youth and Non-Youth	6	
	Youth = 6 None-Youth = 1,8	

12. GENERAL AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service-level agreement (SLA) between the DSBD and the successful service provider.

13. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

DSBD will own the copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought into the assignment or that owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without DSBD's written permission.

14. ENQUIRIES

14.1. Proposal enquiries

The email address to which the proposal and/or related questions of clarity must be submitted is dsbdtenders@dsbd.gov.za

14.2. Technical Enquiries to the Evaluation Team

Name: Ms. Patricia Langa

Director: Sector-Wide Monitoring and

Telephone Number: 066 110 9877

EvaluationEmail: PLanga@dsbd.gov.za

1. BID INFORMATION -Move towards the end

Information on the format and delivery of bids are contained in the attached bid documents. Please take note of the closing date.

2. PROPOSAL FORMAT

- **Annexure A** must contain the published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure B** must contain the proposal and services offered.
- **Annexure C** must contain a summary of the qualifications of evaluation and work experience of personnel.
- **Annexure D** must contain pricing information.
- **Annexure E** must contain all other forms/certificates required (SBDs, Tax clearance certificate etc. see bid documents).

3. CONDITIONS OF BID

3.1. Administrative compliance

See bid documents

3.2. Functional Evaluation

Only bids / quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids / quotes will be scored by the Bid Evaluation Committee against the functional criteria indicated in the Terms of Reference.

Minimum functional requirements: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75%), based on the average of scores awarded by the Bid Evaluation Committee members.

3.3. Price evaluation: The PPPFA

See bid documents

ANNEXURE A

Please note this checklist must be completed and submitted together with the **Financial Proposal** (Envelope 1)

Document that must be submitted	Non-submission may result in disqualification?	
Invitation to Bid SBD 1	YES/NO	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Tax Status	YES/NO	i. Proof of Registration on the Central Supplier Database (Refer Section 4.1.5) ii. Vendor number iii. In the event where the Bidder submits a hard copy of the Tax Clearance Certificate, the CSD verification outcome will take precedence.
Pricing Schedule-SBD 3.3	YES/NO	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Declaration of Interest SBD 4	YES/NO	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Preference Point Claim Form SBD 6.1	YES/NO	Non-declaration and non-submission of the Sworn Affidavit and a valid BEE Certificate issued by a SANAS Accredited supplier will lead to a zero (0) score on BBBEE
Registration on Central Supplier Database (CSD)	NO	The Service Provider must be registered on the CSD. If you are not registered proceed to complete the registration of your company prior to submitting your proposal. Visit https://secure.csd.gov.za/ to obtain your vendor number. Submit proof of registration.
Functional Proposal including Mandatory documents (Envelope 2)	YES	Submit a functional proposal in line with the Terms of Reference including the SBD documents above.
Pricing Schedule (Envelope 1)	YES	Submit full details of the pricing proposal

ToR Approved

YES



NO



Signature:





Date: 17 November 2025

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

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.

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:

.....

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

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.

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

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
OWNERSHIP	2
SIZE OF ENTERPRISE (SMMES): MICRO, SMALL, MEDIUM ENTERPRISES	8
SPATIAL (RURAL/ TOWNSHIP/ CITY)	4

YOUTH AND NON-YOUTH	6
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:

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

Where

- P_s = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
- P_t = Price of tender under consideration
- P_{min} = 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:

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

Where

- Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
Pt = Price of tender under consideration
Pmax = 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.)

The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	Number of points allocated (90/10 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points allocated (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points claimed (90/10 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
OWNERSHIP	1	2		
	Level 1 = 1 pts Level 2 = 0,125pts Level 3 = 0 pts Level 4 = 0 pts Level 5 = 0 pts Level 6 = 0 pts Level 7 = 0 pts Level 8 = 0 pts Non-compliant contributor= 0	Level 1 = 2 pts Level 2 = 1,75 pts Level 3 = 1,5 pts Level 4 = 1,25 pts Level 5 = 1 pts Level 6 = 0,75 pts Level 7 = 0,5 pts Level 8 = 0,25 pts Non-compliant contributor= 0		
Size of Enterprise (SMMES): MICRO, SMALL, MEDIUM ENTERPRISES	4	8		
	Micro = 4 Small = 3,6 Medium = 2 Large = 1,6	Micro = 8 Small = 5,6 Medium = 3,2 Large = 0,8		
Spatial (Rural/ Township/ City)	2	4		
	Rural = 2 Township = 1,2 City = 0,4	Rural = 4 Township = 2,4 City = 0,8		
Youth and Non-Youth	3	6		
	Youth = 3 None-Youth = 0,9	Youth = 6 None-Youth = 1,8		

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: