



SCM /Tender Ref #:	DPME 08-2017/18
--------------------	-----------------

Request for proposals for:	Implementation evaluation of the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy	
Closing date and time:	<b>04 August 2017- 12:00pm</b> @ 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield Pretoria with provision of <b>one</b> electronic and <b>six</b> hard copies of the proposal.	
Compulsory briefing session:	Date: <b>13 July 2017</b>	Time: <b>11:30</b>
	Place: Room 284, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, East-Wing, Union Building <b>NB :( RSA ID) is required for entrance to the union buildings</b>	

Planned date of award of bid:	Expected project start date:	Expected project end date:
<b>31 August 2017</b>	1 November 2017	30 November 2018

### 1. BID INFORMATION

Information on the format and delivery of bids is contained in the attached bid documents. Please take note of the closing date and date of compulsory briefing session (if any).

### 2. PROPOSAL FORMAT

**A detailed proposal in response to this ToR must be submitted.** The proposal should contain all the information required to evaluate the bid against the requirements stipulated in this terms of reference. The following must be attached to the proposal as annexures:

- **Annexure A:** Summary of past experience (Must use attached template)
- **Annexure B:** Summary details of proposed team and time allocated to project (Must use attached template)
- **Annexure C:** Pricing information. Price proposals must include VAT, should be fully inclusive to deliver the all outputs indicated in the terms of reference and must be submitted in a separate envelope (Must use attached template).
- **Annexure D:** The published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure E:** All other forms / certificates required (see bid documents).

### 3. CONDITIONS OF BID

Detailed conditions applicable to all bids are contained in the bid documents accompanying this Terms of Reference. Only suppliers that meet all the requirements stipulated in the terms of reference and bid documents will be considered.

No late bids will be accepted. Only bids from service providers that attended the compulsory briefing session (if specified above) will be considered. Bids must be valid for a minimum period of 120 days after the closing date.

SCM Contact person	<b>Name:</b> Ms Ziyanda Mtwu-Modupe <b>Tel:</b> 012 312 0416 <b>e-mail:</b> Ziyanda@dpme.gov.za
--------------------	---

**1. BACKGROUND / CONTEXT**

South Africa experiences high levels of crime. A survey conducted by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime for the period of 1990 to 2000, ranked South Africa second globally for rates of assault and murder per capita and first for rapes per capita in a data set of 60 countries<sup>1</sup>. Of particular concern is the rate of young people’s involvement in criminal activities. These high rates of crime and the normalization of violence has a historical context. It is to a large extent a result of decades of state sanctioned violence against society and the history of political violence which peaked around the 80s<sup>2</sup>. Although violent crime in South Africa has decreased and stabilized since the 80s, it has stabilized at high levels<sup>3</sup>, for example the South African Police Service (2016) report shows that over 18 673 cases of murder, nearly 51 895 cases of sexual offences and 132 527 cases of armed robbery were recorded in 2015/16<sup>4</sup>.

The Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) argues that high rates of crime and violence in the country are driven by high inequality and structural exclusion of majority from participating meaningful in the economy<sup>5</sup>. This is complicated by a lack of respect for the rule of law, impunity and mistrust of the police, rooted in long history of unjust laws and inequality in law enforcement. Despite many gains in expanding access to services and social security majority of South Africans live in communities with social conditions that produce and reproduce crime and violence. This is shown in research conducted by Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention(CJCP) which found that most young offenders had themselves been victims of crime, had witnessed a violent interpersonal dispute in their homes, knew family members who were engaged in illicit activities that could get them into trouble with the law, had family members who were or had been imprisoned as well as they knew people in their communities who were violent crime perpetrators.

Addressing crime and violence has been in the agenda of the democratic government since 1995. In 1995 the South African Police developed Community Safety Plan, a package of short-term policing measures aimed at tackling the priority crimes in the country. This was followed by a long-term National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) which intended to tackle the root causes of crime, in parallel to the Police’s Community Safety Plan, which would deliver more effective responses to crimes which had already been committed or planned. The NCPS introduced a paradigm shift in the country’s response to crime, complimenting law enforcement and criminal justice system with situational and social interventions. It also emphasized prevention of crime<sup>6</sup>. However, Rauch argues that in implementation the NCPS failed to transform the country’s approach to crime. Partly because the responsibility for the strategy remained with SAPS<sup>7</sup>.

Recognizing the complex causes of crime and violence, and the limits of the NCPS government adopted the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy (ISCPS) in 2011/12. The ISCPS provides a framework for addressing the underlying causes of delinquency, violence and crime, rather than reacting to the symptoms and the immediate needs. By moving the responsibility of the strategy from SAPS to Social Development, government intends to recommit to social crime prevention and emphasize interventions to mitigate risk factors known to be associated with criminality especially in individuals at risk, something that the NCPS is perceived to have failed in doing). This focus on primary prevention will build the capacity of individuals considered to be at risk, to be self-reliant by strengthening family preservation and community ties, and lowering school dropout rates. The strategy recognizes and supports that primary and secondary prevention need to precede tertiary crime prevention strategies which are designed to curtail recidivism, and have historically been the preserve of SAPS and the Department of Correctional Services. Like the NCPS the ISCPS promotes collaboration and partnership, both between government institutions and between government and Communities, NGOs, CBOs and FBOs.

<sup>1</sup> NationMaster: South African crime statistics

<sup>3</sup> Masuku S. “Prevention is better than cure: Addressing violent crime in South Africa” in SA Crime Quarterly (ed.)2000 Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies

<sup>4</sup> SAPS 2015/16 Crime Statistics Report

<sup>5</sup> Gould, C. (2014). Why is crime and violence so high in South Africa? <https://africacheck.org/2014/09/17/comment-why-is-crime-and-violence-so-high-in-south-africa-2/>

<sup>6</sup> Rauch, J. (2001). The 1996 National Crime Prevention Strategy. <https://www.csvr.org.za/docs/crime/1996nationalcrime.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Masuku S. “Prevention is better than cure: Addressing violent crime in South Africa” in SA Crime Quarterly (ed.)2000 Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies

Since the approval of the strategy an Action Plan was adopted in 2012/13, various forums established to coordinate the activities in the strategy, and training was rolled out to NGOs and other departments. However, implementation has been slow. Lack of budget to implement inter-departmental programmes, inability to maintaining consistent engagements between stakeholders, are some of the challenges that have been faced in the implementation of the ISCPs.

## **2. PROBLEM STATEMENT / PURPOSE**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy is being implemented, the likelihood that it will contribute to effective social crime prevention in the country and how it can be strengthened.

## **3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT**

### **3.1 Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation will respond to the following key questions:

- 1. Was the ISCPs a relevant response to crime when it was developed? (relevance)**
  - 1.1. Is the strategy an appropriate response to crime and violence?
  - 1.2. How does the strategy align with other national crime prevention strategies such as the National Crime Prevention Strategy and the Civilian Secretariat White Paper on safety and security?
  - 1.3. Is there vertical alignment between the strategy and provincial and city level crime and violence reduction interventions?
  - 1.4. Are there duplications, contradictions and overlaps between strategies and what are the implications of this for the country's response to violence and crime?
- 2. Does the strategy provide adequate policy direction for government and civil society on social crime prevention? (internal coherence)**
  - 2.1. Is the Theory of Change of the ISCPs clear and well-articulated?
  - 2.2. Are the interventions and intended outcomes well specified?
  - 2.3. To what extent does the strategy address gendered nature of violence and crime?
  - 2.4. Is the strategy enabling government to respond to different forms of vulnerability?
  - 2.5. Is there a coherent M&E framework with agreed indicators to measure the implementation and performance of the ISCPs?
  - 2.6. Is the monitoring data collected adequate for future impact assessment?
- 3. To what extent does the ISCPs implementation model translate the strategy ideals to systematic interventions in communities? (effectiveness) Is there evidence of**
  - 3.1. Departments, provincial and local government awareness of the content of the strategy?
  - 3.2. A coherent social crime prevention approach in government and civil society?
  - 3.3. Increased focus on social crime prevention within government and in civil society?
  - 3.4. Departments and other implementing agencies working together to implement social crime prevention?
  - 3.5. Mainstreaming of crime prevention in different programmes of government at national, provincial and local levels?
  - 3.6. Increased participation of communities in social crime prevention initiatives?
  - 3.7. Increased and effective collaboration between government, civil society and communities in social crime prevention?
  - 3.8. How well coordinated is the implementation of strategy?
  - 3.9. Does the IGR framework enable/facilitate multidisciplinary and multisectoral implementation and achievement of safety outcomes?
  - 3.10. Are institutional arrangements and location of the strategy in DSD appropriate to drive implementation?
  - 3.11. What can be learned from other multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder crime and violence prevention interventions?
- 4. Are the resources allocated for the implementation of the ISCPs adequate and are they utilized efficiently? (efficiency)**
  - 4.1 How have the resources been utilized to bring about coherent crime and violence prevention nationally, provincially and at local government level?

5. **Are there indications that the ISCPs is effective in addressing the social conditions that produce crime and violence? (impact)** To what extent is there evidence that the ISCPs is contributing to:
  - 5.1. Strengthening internal and external capacity to sustain improved service delivery to poor communities?
  - 5.2. Ensuring equitable and integrated site based service delivery to individuals considered at risk?
  - 5.3. Strengthening vulnerable families, making them more resilient and able to care for children?
  - 5.4. Reduction in school drop-out?
  - 5.5. Reducing substance abuse by children and adults?
  - 5.6. Strengthening in livelihoods for communities and individual?
6. What are the lessons learnt in the implementation of the strategy? Should the strategy be retained and if so how can the design and implementation of the strategy be strengthened?

**3.2 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation**

Table 1 summarises the main users and how they are likely to use the evaluation results. This is important in conceptualising the consultation during the evaluation and in dissemination of the results.

**Table 1: Main users and stakeholders of the evaluation results**

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Likely use of the results</b>
Department of Social Development	Improve the design of the Strategy Better provide policy guidance to government and civil society
Civilian secretariat	Explore potential for harmonization and collaboration
Department for Women	Improve monitoring of the strategy in relation to VAW
Department of Home Affairs	Better understand their role in reducing violence and crime
Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (including National Prosecuting Authority)	Structure non-punitive responses to offenders (i.e. diversion programmes for both adults and children offenders)
Department of Basic Education	Structure better referral system for children identified as at risk Integrated Social crime prevention with curriculum and school culture
South African Police Service	Improve policing
COGTA	Give better direction to Municipality in their management of urban spaces as part of crime prevention
Civil Society	Improve interventions in communities and measures to hold government to account in implementing the strategy
Correctional Services	Improve the provision of rehabilitation services to offenders to reduce recidivism

**4. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH**

**4.1 Methodology**

The evaluation questions will be best responded to through a mixed method approach including document review, literature review, and limited primary data collection. Both primary and secondary data will need to be collected. DSD has implemented five projects in Mpumalanga, Northern Cape, Free State, and Eastern Cape while there are other projects such as Violence prevention programmes through urban upgrading in Khayelitsha, Khulisa Social Crime prevention project in KZN Midlands, etc. driven by CSOs. At least two of each categories of project should be studied in details to understand the factors that make for success project implementation and sustained effects. The following detailed approach is suggested:

<b>Overarching questions</b>	<b>Data collection tool</b>	<b>Data source</b>
Was the ISCPs a relevant response to crime when it was developed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Expert roundtable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informant literature</li> <li>• CSIR (crime prevention work), Civilian secretariat, SACN urban safety reference group, SAPS, GIZ safer spacers resource portal etc.); CSV research, ISS, CI, Optimus study</li> </ul>

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>Overarching questions</b>	<b>Data collection tool</b>	<b>Data source</b>
Does the strategy provide adequate policy direction for government and civil society on social crime prevention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Expert roundtable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departments strategic and annual plans and reports</li> <li>• Relevant departments</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Sector Experts</li> </ul>
To what extent does the ISCPS implementation model translate the strategy ideals to systematic interventions in communities? (effectiveness) Is there evidence of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community level case studies</li> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Departmental Strategic and annual Plans and reports</li> <li>• Integrated Action Plan</li> <li>• Terms of Reference for the multidisciplinary social crime prevention committee</li> <li>• Minutes and related documents from the multidisciplinary social crime prevention committee</li> <li>• Departmental Strategic and annual Plans and reports</li> <li>• Integrated Action Plan</li> <li>• Projects utilizing multi-sectoral approaches to reducing crime and Violence</li> <li>• Civil society and members of community</li> <li>• Representatives of departments</li> <li>• Civilian Secretariat research on IGR framework</li> <li>• Implementation framework for the ISCPS</li> <li>• Case studies</li> </ul>
Are the resources allocated for the implementation of the ISCPS adequate and are they utilized efficiently?	Budget and expenditure analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget and expenditure reports</li> </ul>
Are there indications that the ISCPS is effective in addressing the social conditions that produce crime and violence?	Interviews Focus groups or survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department and NGOs M&amp;E reports</li> <li>• Civil society and members of community</li> <li>• Representatives of departments</li> <li>• SACN state of urban safety reports</li> <li>• STASSA (community survey 2016, VOCS)</li> </ul>

Note: though an evaluation approach has been suggested, this does not preclude a service provider from recommending a different methodological approach considered more responsive or more innovative. Should a service provider apply the approach provided in the ToRs, the service provider will be expected to propose a detailed methodology and innovation and creativity in this regard will be an added advantage.

**4.2. Scope of the evaluation**

The following is the scope of the evaluation:

- Building on the work of ISS-UNICEF Dialogue Forum on VAC map all crime and violence prevention strategies/plans/policies at national, provincial and local level, reflecting their interdependencies and overlaps
- Hold an evaluative roundtable with important stakeholders including Think Tanks and research institutions such as ISS, CSVR, MRC, etc., government and civil society organizations.
- Data should be collected from at least departments in law enforcement, criminal justice system and social sector (including social development, education, health, human settlements, etc.) both at national and provincial level and center of government departments such as COGTA, National Treasury and DPME.

## DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE

- At least four metropolitan municipalities and two secondary cities (growing urban areas) should be included
- Data will also need to be collected from community members
- Primary data collection from the case studies

### 5. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES (Bidder to ensure they meet minimum functional criteria 6 and 7)

#### 5.1 Products / deliverables expected from the evaluation

The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- **Inception Report** by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, evaluation design and methodology;
- Finalised **Theory of Change (ToC) and Logical Framework** for the ISPCS. A draft exists that requires finalization. The evaluation should test this theory of change and then at the end make suggestions for changes.
- **Systematic literature review** which draws on analysis of the ISPCS document, related policies, regulations, frameworks, review both grey and published literature on the ISPCS and its implementation, and provides analytical framework for the evaluation. This should include the map of interventions to reduce violence in the country;
- **Roundtable report**
- **Data collection instruments** and other tools;
- **Draft evaluation report** integrating findings from the roundtable, literature synthesis and data collected from the case studies for review with a policy and executive summary;
- **Workshop with stakeholders** to validate and discuss the findings and recommendations;
- **Revised draft evaluation report** based on stakeholder feedback (full and in 1/5/25 format), including written feedback from the DSD and DPME.
- The **final evaluation reports**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic;
- A revised theory of change, logframe and implementation model for the ISPCS.
- Provision of all **datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- A Power-point or audio-visual **presentation of the results**.

#### 5.2 Milestones

The indicative timeframe for the evaluation is twelve months in total, including *non-billable* time. The evaluation will start at the beginning of November and should be completed by end of November 2018.

The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 2**.

**Table 2: PROJECT PLAN OUTLINE AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

Milestone/Deliverable	Milestone/Delivery Date	% payment
Indicative Start Date and Inception Briefing Meeting	1 November 2017	
Approved Inception Report		10%
Service Provider contract signed		
Submission of systematic literature review		20%
Roundtable held		
Roundtable report		20%
Data collection tools		
Draft Full Evaluation Report integrating the literature review, the roundtable findings and case studies)		30%
Stakeholder Validation Workshop to discuss the draft report (summary slides)		
Submission of Draft 2 Report full and draft 1/5/25 report incorporating inputs from the workshop		
Approval of final evaluation reports (approval by Steering Committee)		10%

## DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE

Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts).		
Submission of revised ToC, Logframe and implementation model for the ISPCS		10%

### 6. EXPERIENCE / SKILLS / TEAM COMPOSITION REQUIRED ( Bidder to ensure they meet the minimum functional criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4 )

The attached templates must be used to summarise qualifications, skills and past experience.

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website. The service provider will be assessed against some of these competencies:

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
<b>1 Overarching Considerations</b>	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 14 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments. Have knowledge of the local, provincial & national government system and its legislations.
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
<b>2 Evaluation Leadership</b>	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs) <sup>8</sup> and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table)
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
<b>3 Evaluation Craft</b>	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation, and use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods. Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
<b>4 Implementation of Evaluation</b>	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme log-frames with good programme logic and indicators
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards

<sup>8</sup> By PDIs we mean people of Black, Indian, and Coloured ethnicity. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>Domain/descriptor</b>	<b>Demonstrated ability to</b>
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.

**6.1. Experience required (Bidder to ensure they meet the minimum functional criteria 1)**

Bidders will demonstrate adequate experience through the number, types and geographical spread of projects/assignments undertaken. The attached template must be used to summarise experience. The proposal should contain letters of reference, CVs of proposed team members or other means of verifying past experience.

**6.2. Team composition (Bidder to ensure they meet the minimum functional criteria 2, 3 and 4)**

At least 30% of each team must consist of Previously Disadvantaged Individuals and these individuals must play a meaningful role in the project

The team contained in the proposal must be available for the duration of the project. Replacement of team members may only be done in consultation with DPME and replacement team members must have at least the same qualifications / skills / experience as those they are replacing.

The evaluation requires a combination of skills and expertise. The team should have at minimum a sector expert on violence and crime prevention, M&E expert and project manager. Ideally, these should be three different individuals. The proposed sector and M&E specialists must have formal qualifications in their respective areas of expertise at least at honours level.

The service provider should clearly specify the number of evaluators to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Postgraduate Degrees. Inclusion of an appropriate international expert will be advantageous.

**6.3 Structure and contents of proposal (Bidder to ensure they meet the minimum functional criteria 8)**

A structure and contents of a proposal required from the service provider is shown in **Box 2** below.

**Box 2: Structure of a proposal**

The tenderer must provide the following details. Failure to provide this will lead disqualification.

1. Understanding of the outcomes systems, current planning frameworks, the NDP and its working in practice and the TORs.
2. 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).
3. Activity-based evaluation plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities – it is particularly that efforts levels for key national and international resources are clear).
4. Detailed activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT)
5. Competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and sub-contractors, making clear who did what and contact people for references)



6. Background to the service provider including BBBE status and competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references)
7. Team (team members, expertise, roles and level of effort for each member of the team)
8. Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)
9. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

**Attachments**

Example of reports of 2 politically sensitive and complex evaluations undertaken.  
 CVs of key personnel  
 Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

**6.4 Management arrangements**

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Technical Working Group and an Evaluation Steering Committee.

**6.4.1 Role ETWG**

The ETWG is responsible for day to day project management.

**6.4.2 Role of the Steering Committee**

A Steering Committee has been established comprising DPME, GIZ, CSVr, DBE, NT, DSD, SAPS, DoJ, DCS, DoW, Civilian Secretariat and local government representatives. It will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables. The chair of the committee will be a representative of senior management within the Welfare Services Chief Directorate.

**6.4.3 Peer reviewers**

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment. Two peer reviewers will be contracted to focus on both content and methodology of the assignment. The peer reviewers will provide their independent expert view on appropriate approaches, methods, instruments and data analysis as to ensure quality at the different stages of the assignment.

**6.4.4 Reporting arrangements**

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report to is Ms Matodzi Amisi, Director: Evaluation, DPME.

**7. COSTING METHODOLOGY**

Thee bidder should cost the project according to the outputs/deliverables outlines in section 5 above. Prices must be inclusive of VAT (if VAT registered) and must address all deliverables indicated in this ToR.

**8. EVALUATION OF BIDS**

**8.1. Administrative requirements**

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

**8.2. Functional evaluation Part 1 (mandatory)**

Criteria		Yes	No
1	Project team leader has extensive experience in crime and/or social crime prevention		
2	Multi-disciplinary team with at least a criminologist/social worker/M&E expert		

Only bids that meet all administrative requirements and all the mandatory requirements indicated above (if any) will be evaluated using the functional evaluation criteria indicated below (functional evaluation part 2).

8.3. Functional evaluation Part 2

Weight allocation	Scoring system
1 – Value adding requirement (minimum score of 2) 3 – Important requirement (minimum score of 6 or 9) 5 – Essential requirement / integral part of project (minimum score of 15)	1 – Does not comply with the requirements 2 – Partial compliance with requirements 3 – Full compliance with requirements 4 – Exceeds requirements

Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Min. Score
<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>Experience (as specified in ToRs): Demonstrated experience of undertaking similar projects</b>                      1= No evidence that bidder has undertaken similar projects.                      2= Bidder has successfully undertaken 1 or 2 similar projects                      3= Bidder has successfully undertaken 3 or 4 similar projects                      4= Bidder has successfully undertaken 5 or more similar projects</p>	5			15
<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>Skills (as specified in ToRs):</b>                      1= The proposed team does not meet the skills requirement.                      2= The proposed team meets some of the skills requirements                      3= The proposed team meets all of the skills requirements.                      4= The proposed team exceeds the skills requirements</p>	3			9
<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>Qualifications (as specified in ToRs):</b>                      1= The sector and M&amp;E specialists does not meet any of the qualifications requirements.                      2= The sector and M&amp;E specialists meet at least half but not all the qualifications requirements.                      3= The sector and M&amp;E specialists meet the minimum qualifications requirements                      4= The sector and M&amp;E specialists exceed the qualifications requirements</p>	3			9
<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>Team composition (as specified in ToRs): At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)<sup>9</sup> and they must play a meaningful role in the project:</b>                      1= Team consists of less than 30% PDIs <u>and</u> less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs.                      2= Team consists of less than 30% PDIs <u>or</u> less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs.                      3= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs and at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs.                      4= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists / team leaders is PDI.</p>	5			15

<sup>9</sup> By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example, if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Functional Evaluation Criteria		Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Min. Score
5	<b>Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries.</b> 1= No international experience available 2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project 3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight 4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)	3			6
6	<b>Deliverable time frames (as specified in ToRs):</b> 1= Proposed time frames do not meet the requirements 2= Proposed time frames meet some of the requirements. Delays unlikely to have a significant impact on the outcome 3= Time frames proposed are in line with requirements 4= The service provider proposes innovative solutions to deliver the project ahead of schedule	3			9
7	Extend to which the costing methodology is realistic given the scope and time frames of the project: 1= Costing of the project is not aligned to the scope and times frames of the project 2= Costing of the project not entirely aligned to scope and time frames and may negatively impact delivery 3= The costing methodology is realistic given the scope and time frames of the project 4= The costing methodology provides innovative solutions to reduce costs associated with the project	3			6
8	<b>Quality of the proposal (as specified in ToRs).</b> The proposal meets the requirements in the ToRs: 1= The requirements of the evaluation not addressed at all. 2= Requirements of the evaluation partially addressed but not convincing. 3= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and convincingly. 4= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and additional value added	5			15
<b>TOTAL</b>					

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

**8.4. PRICE / BBBEE / PPPFA**

Only bids that meet the minimum administrative and functional requirements / specifications indicated in the ToR will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations – see attached bid documents.

**9. SPECIAL CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THIS BID**

**9.1 Key background documents**

- Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy

- White Paper on Safety and Security
- National Crime Prevention Strategy

## 9.2 Evaluation Criteria for proposal

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors include:

- Quality of proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Team leaders' levels of expertise;
- Qualifications and expertise of the evaluation team;
- Inclusion of PDI members in the evaluation team who will gain experience.

## 10. GENERAL

### 10.1. The Service Provider undertakes to:

- 10.1.1. Conduct business in a courteous and professional manner.
- 10.1.2. Provide the necessary documentation as requested prior to the awarding of the contract.
- 10.1.3. Comply with all relevant employment legislation and applicable bargaining council agreements, including UIF, PAYE, etc. DPME may monitor compliance for the duration of the contract and implement penalties for non-compliance.
- 10.1.4. Manage internal disputes among his/her staff in such a way that DPME is not affected by those disputes.
- 10.1.5. Comply with the DPME security and emergency policies, procedures and regulations at DPME premises.
- 10.1.6. Ensure that all work performed and all equipment used at DPME facilities are in compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act no. 85 of 1993) and any regulations promulgated in terms of this Act and the standard instructions of DPME;
- 10.1.7. Ensure that all staff working on this project are adequately trained prior to the commencement of the project.
- 10.1.8. Ensure that DPME is informed of any changes in staff related to the execution of the project. For security reasons, DPME reserves the right to vet all persons working on this project.
- 10.1.9. Undertakes to store and handover all data generated by the project to DPME in an accessible and confidential manner.

### 10.2. DPME undertakes to:

- 10.2.1. Manage the contract in a professional manner.
- 10.2.2. Provide appropriate information as and when required and only in situations where it is required by the service provider to fulfil their duties.
- 10.2.3. Not accept any responsibility for any damages suffered by the service provider or their staff for the duration of the project.
- 10.2.4. Not tolerate any unfair labour practices between the service provider and their staff that happen during the execution of the project activities.
- 10.2.5. Not accept any responsibility for accounts/expenses incurred by the service provider that was not agreed upon by the contracting parties.

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>ANNEXURE A: SUMMARY OF PAST EXPERIENCE (Attach reference letters or other means of verification)</b>					
<b>Project description</b>	<b>Client name</b>	<b>Client contact name, number, e-mail address</b>	<b>Contract start date</b>	<b>Contract end date</b>	<b>Contract value</b>

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>ANNEXURE B1: DETAILS OF PROPOSED TEAM (Attach copies of qualifications)</b>						
Name	Role	Qualifications	Experience	Race	Gender	Days allocated to this project
<b>Total 1<sup>1</sup></b>						

<b>ANNEXURE B2: TIME ALLOCATIONS FOR PROPOSED TEAM</b>								
Activity / deliverable	Person days allocated per activity / team member							Total
	(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)	(name)	
<b>Total 2<sup>1</sup></b>								

<sup>1</sup>Totals 1 and 2 must be the same

**DPME TERMS OF REFERENCE**

<b>ANNEXURE C1: COSTING OF GOODS</b> (Leave blank if not required)				
Description	# of units	Unit cost (VAT incl.)	Total cost (VAT incl.)	Lead time (Days)
<b>TOTAL C1</b>				

<b>ANNEXURE C2: COSTING OF SERVICES</b> (Deliverable dates based on expected project start date indicated on page 1 of the ToR)		
Description of deliverable	Completion date	Cost (VAT incl.)
<b>TOTAL C2</b>		

<b>TOTAL BID PRICE (C1 + C2) incl. VAT</b> Please ensure that this price matches the price indicated on SBD 1	R
--	---

<b>ANNEXURE C3: OTHER DISBURSEMENTS</b> (Time and Material costs not included in total bid price)	
Description of other disbursement	Cost (VAT incl.)



The term "Bid" Includes price quotations, advertised competitive bids, limited bids and proposals.

Document	Check Bidder	Verified SCM Unit
Invitation to bid (SBD 1)		
Declaration of interest (SBD 4)		
Preference Points Claim (SBD 6.1)		
Declaration of past supply chain management practices (SBD 8)		
Certificate of Independent Bid Determination (SBD 9)		
Valid B-BBEE Status Level Verification Certificate (Original or Certified Copy) bearing SANAS logo. QMEs/EMEs: Sworn affidavit / CIPC confirmation of turnover etc.		
Central Suppliers Database Registration Report Attached – Not older than 30 days NB: Only suppliers registered on CSD may bid.		
<b>Additional documentation required for certain types of bids. If applicable the additional documents will be distributed as part of the tender / bid documentation</b>	<b>Check Bidder</b>	<b>Verified SCM Unit</b>
Declaration certificate for local production and content for designated sectors (SBD 6.2)		

<b>Declaration</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>I have read and agree to the General Conditions of Contract related to Government procurement (Available on DPME tenders web page or from National Treasury)</li><li>I have read the DPME standard Service Level Agreement (SLA) and have included in my (our) proposal and material changes that may be required to the SLA.</li><li>I have completed and submitted all the documents indicated in the above checklist</li><li>I have read and agree with the terms and conditions applicable to all bids as stipulated in this document</li><li>I have noted and will comply with the delivery time frames indicated in the specifications / terms of Reference</li><li>I am the authorised signatory of the applicant</li><li>For the purposes of section 256 of the Tax Administration Act of 2011 I authorise the South African Revenue Service to disclose "taxpayer information" as contemplated under the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Act in relation to the compliance status of tax registration, tax debt and filing requirements to the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.</li></ul>			
Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			



## TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

**ALL DPME BID DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FREE OF CHARGE FROM THE DPME WEBSITE OR DPME OFFICES AND MAY THEREFORE NOT BE SOLD**

### 1. GENERAL

This request is issued in terms of the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) as amended (PFMA), Treasury Regulations, the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act 5 of 2000 (PPPFA), the Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2017 (PPR), Supply Chain Management instructions issued by the National Treasury, General Conditions of Contract published by National Treasury (GCC), the B-BBEE Act (Act 53 of 2003) as well as applicable Departmental Policies.

- Lead times / delivery periods should be clearly indicated in the quotation / proposal where applicable. The Department reserves the right to cancel any order where the delivery period indicated in the quotation / proposal is extended.
- The Department reserves the right to require delivery of the goods as specified, at the price quoted, regardless of any differences in specifications contained in the quotation.
- The department reserves the right NOT to appoint any Service Provider or to withdraw this request for bids/proposals.
- The department reserves the right to split the award of the bid between two or more Service Providers or to award only a part of the bid.
- The Department reserves the right to call bidders that meet the minimum functional requirements to present their proposals. The Bid Evaluation Committee may decide to amend the scoring assigned to a particular bid based on the presentation made.

### 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 Department to view the taxpayer's profile and tax status.
- 2.3. Application for the tax compliance status (TCS) certificate or pin may also be made via e-filing. In order to use this provision, taxpayers will need to register with SARS as e-filers through the website [www.sars.gov.za](http://www.sars.gov.za).
- 2.4. The tax compliance requirements are not applicable to foreign bidders / individuals with no South African tax obligation, no history of doing business in South Africa. Foreign suppliers must complete a pre-award questionnaire from SARS on their tax obligation categorisation.
- 2.5. Bidders may also submit an original printed TCS certificate together with the bid.
- 2.6. In bids where consortia / joint ventures / sub-contractors are involved, each party must submit a separate TCS certificate / pin / CSD number.
- 2.7. Where no TCS is available but the bidder is registered on the central supplier database (CSD), a CSD number must be provided.

### 3. ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE

Only proposals that comply with all administrative requirements (including tax compliance requirements) will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids may be rejected. All documents indicated on page 1 must be submitted with each bid. Bidders must use the Standards Bid Documents (SBDs) included in this document (documents may not be re-typed)

All quoted prices should be valid (firm) for at least 120 days from the closing date indicated on SBD 1 and must be **inclusive of VAT**. Prices dependent on the **exchange rate** should include reference to the exchange rate used. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted unless specifically allowed in the ToR.

### 4. FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION

Functional criteria and/or specifications are contained in the specifications sheet or Terms of Reference. Unless otherwise indicated in the ToR, only service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each functional criteria as well as the overall minimum score (75%) will proceed to the PPPFA evaluation phase.

## TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

### 5. PRICE EVALUATION: THE PPPFA

Only bids that meet the minimum functional requirements / specifications indicated in the ToR will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1. The applicable evaluation method is indicated in SBD 6.1.

Consortia or joint ventures must take note of SBD 6.1, paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 regarding requirements for B-BBEE certificates.

If the 80/20 preference point system is specified on SBD 6.1 and all bids received exceed R50,000,000, the bid will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

### 6. REJECTION OF QUOTES / PROPOSALS

Any effort by a bidder to influence the evaluation, comparisons or award decisions in any manner, may result in rejection of the quote / proposal concerned. DPME shall reject a quote / proposal if the bidder has committed a proven corrupt or fraudulent act in competing for a particular contract. DPME may disregard any quote / proposal if the bidder or any of its subcontractors:

- a) Is not tax compliant
- b) Have abused the Supply Chain Management (SCM) system of the Department or any other government department.
- c) Have committed proven fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system.
- d) Have failed to perform on any previous contract.
- e) Supplied incorrect information in the bid documentation.

### 7. VETTING

The Department reserves the right to approach the relevant authorities to verify the following for each bidder:

- Citizenship status (individuals)
- Company information
- Criminal records (individuals)
- Previous tender and government contract track records
- Government employment status (individuals)
- Company / closed corporation ownership / membership status (individuals)
- Suitability to handle confidential government information
- Qualifications of bidders / contractors / team members
- Any other information contained in bid documents

### 8. REGISTRATION ON DPME SUPPLIERS DATABASE

If not already registered, the successful bidder will be registered on the DPME suppliers database. The following terms and conditions apply:

- 8.1. All suppliers must be registered on the central suppliers database managed by National Treasury ([www.csd.gov.za](http://www.csd.gov.za)) before they can register on the DPME suppliers database.
- 8.2. All information will be treated confidentially.
- 8.3. Applications that are incomplete or that are not accompanied by the required documents will be disqualified. The included checklist should be completed to ensure completeness of the application.
- 8.4. Completed application forms should be posted to or hand delivered at the above mentioned addresses. No e-mail or fax copies can be accepted
- 8.5. The Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation's (DPME) Service Provider Database will be used mainly for the purposes of identifying entities (individuals or juristic persons) when price quotations for

## TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL BIDS

goods and services are to be invited. Requests for quotations / proposals are normally sent by e-mail to the address provided on the supplier registration form. The fact that an entity is registered as a supplier does not constitute any contractual relationship between the entity and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

- 8.6. Suppliers may list a maximum of 5 categories of goods and services offered (Section 4). Where a supplier lists more than 5 categories, the DPME may at its own discretion reject the application or select the 5 most applicable categories.
- 8.7. For procurement above the financial limit applicable to price quotations, as determined from time to time by National Treasury, the DPME will normally invite competitive bids by means of advertisements in the Government Tender Bulletin. The onus is on entities to monitor the tender bulletin and to ensure that they obtain copies of the bidding documents that are available on the DPME when bids are advertised.
- 8.8. The Department reserves the right to approach potential service providers not on the database in cases where an insufficient number of suppliers are registered for a particular commodity or service or an insufficient number of quotations are received in response to a particular request for quotations or proposals.
- 8.9. It is the responsibility of a registered entity to inform the DPME immediately in writing of any changes in the particulars as stated in the application, especially changes in respect of contact details, ownership, B-BBEE and the SMME or EME status of the entity. Should a contract be awarded to an entity based on incorrect particulars provided by that entity, the DPME shall have the right to, in addition to any other remedy that it may have in terms of applicable legislation, cancel the contract and to claim damages.
- 8.10. The DPME reserves the right to cancel the registration of an entity if that entity has given incorrect or false information in the application form or any correspondence relating to the application or:
  - Failed to inform the Department of any changes to the particulars as furnished in the application;
  - Failed to comply with the conditions of any contract that might have been awarded to the entity;
  - The entity has been included on the list of restricted suppliers maintained by National Treasury; or
  - The entity has acted in an improper, fraudulent or corrupt manner.
- 8.11. The DPME reserves the right to cancel the registration of an entity if that entity fails to respond to three or more consecutive requests for quotations / proposals.
- 8.12. The following documentation must accompany this application:
  - All documents included in this application form.
  - Original or certified copy of a valid B-BBEE Status level certificate (must bear SANAS logo), or sworn affidavit in cases of EMEs.
  - Printout from Central Suppliers Database ([www.csd.gov.za](http://www.csd.gov.za)) with supplier unique registration reference.
- 8.13. For the purposes of section 256 of the Tax Administration Act of 2011 the bidder / supplier authorises the South African Revenue Service to disclose "taxpayer information" as contemplated under the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Act in relation to the compliance status of tax registration, tax debt and filing requirements to the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

**INVITATION TO BID (SBD 1)**

**YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO BID FOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION**  
(Subject to the terms and conditions applicable to all bids as indicated earlier in this bid document)

<b>BID NUMBER</b>	DPME 08-2017/18	<b>CLOSING DATE</b>	04 August 2017	<b>CLOSING TIME</b>	12:00
<b>COMPULSORY BRIEFING SESSION</b>	Date		13 July 2017	Time	11:30
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Implementation evaluation of the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy				
<b>BID DOCUMENTS MAY BE POSTED TO:</b> Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Head: Procurement Services Private Bag X944, PRETORIA, 0001			<b>OR DEPOSITED IN THE BID BOX SITUATED AT (STREET ADDRESS):</b> 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria <i>The bid box is accessible on working days between 8:00 and 17:00.</i>		
<b>SUPPLIER INFORMATION</b>					
<b>Name of bidder</b>					
<b>Postal address</b>					
<b>Street address</b>					
<b>Telephone number</b>			<b>Cell phone number</b>		
<b>E-mail address</b>					
<b>Company Reg. #</b>			<b>Vat registration #</b>		
<b>Tax compliance status</b>	<b>Compliant</b>		<b>CSD #</b>		
	<b>Not compliant</b>		<b>TCS Pin (if no CSD #)</b>		
<b>B-BBEE Status Level verification</b>	None				
	All except EMEs: Certificate Issued by verification agency accredited by the SANAS				
	EMEs: Sworn affidavit by EME representative and attested to by Commissioner of oaths or an Accounting Officer as contemplated in the Close Corporation Act (CCA)				
	EMEs: Sworn affidavit by EME representative and attested to by Commissioner of oaths				

<b>Are you the accredited representative in South Africa for the goods /services /works offered? If yes attach proof</b>	YES	NO
<b>FOREIGN SUPPLIERS: Do not complete this form. You must contact the Department to obtain the required documentation to be completed</b>		

<b>Total bid price (Incl. VAT)</b>		<b>Total # of items offered</b>	
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------	--

<b>Signature</b> (Attach proof of authority to sign this bid; e.g. resolution of directors, etc.)		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Name of Signatory</b>			
<b>Designation of Signatory</b>			
<b>Name of bidder (if different)</b>			

**ANY ENQUIRIES REGARDING THE BIDDING PROCEDURE MAY BE DIRECTED TO:**  
Contact persons indicated on the bid documents; or  
Head of Procurement Services, 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield, Pretoria. Tel 012 312 0000

## **DECLARATION OF INTEREST (SBD 4)**

Any legal person, including persons employed by the state<sup>1</sup>, or persons having a kinship with persons employed by the state, including a blood relationship, may make an offer or offers in terms of an invitation to bid (includes a price quotation, advertised competitive bid, limited bid or proposal). In view of possible allegations of favouritism, should the resulting bid, or part thereof, be awarded to persons employed by the state, or to persons connected with or related to them, it is required that the bidder or his/her authorised representative declare his/her position in relation to the evaluating/adjudicating authority where:

- the bidder is employed by the state; and/or
- the legal person on whose behalf the bidding document is signed, has a relationship with persons/a person who are/is involved in the evaluation and or adjudication of the bid(s), or where it is known that such a relationship exists between the person or persons for or on whose behalf the declarant acts and persons who are involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of the bid.

**In order to give effect to the above, the following questionnaire must be completed and submitted.**

1.1 Full Name of bidder or his or her representative: .....

1.2 Identity Number: .....

1.3 Position occupied in Company (director, trustee, shareholder<sup>2</sup>, member): .....

1.3.1 The names of all directors / trustees / shareholders / members, their individual identity numbers, tax reference numbers and, if applicable, employee / PERSAL numbers must be indicated in paragraph 2 below.

1.4 Are you or any person connected with the bidder presently employed by the state? YES NO

1.4.1 If so, furnish the following particulars:

Name of person / director / trustee / shareholder/ member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of state institution at which you or the person connected to the bidder is employed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Position occupied in the state institution:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Any other particulars:

1.4.2 If you are presently employed by the state, did you obtain the appropriate authority to undertake remunerative work outside employment in the public sector? YES NO

1.4.2.1 If yes, did you attached proof of such authority to the bid document? YES NO

(Note: Failure to submit proof of such authority, where applicable, may result in the disqualification of the bid.

1.4.2.2 If no, furnish reasons for non-submission of such proof:

---

<sup>1</sup> State" means –

- (a) any national or provincial department, national or provincial public entity or constitutional institution within the meaning of the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999);
- (b) any municipality or municipal entity;
- (c) provincial legislature;
- (d) national Assembly or the national Council of provinces; or
- (e) Parliament.

<sup>2</sup> "Shareholder" means a person who owns shares in the company and is actively involved in the management of the enterprise or business and exercises control over the enterprise.

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST (SBD 4)**

1.5 Did you or your spouse, or any of the company’s directors /trustees / shareholders / members or their spouses conduct business with the state in the previous twelve months? YES NO

1.5.1 If so, furnish particulars:

\_\_\_\_\_

1.6 Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have any relationship (family, friend, other) with a person employed by the state and who may be involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of this bid? YES NO

1.6.1 If so, furnish particulars:

\_\_\_\_\_

1.7 Are you, or any person connected with the bidder, aware of any relationship (family, friend, other) between any other bidder and any person employed by the state who may be involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of this bid? YES NO

1.7.1 If so, furnish particulars:

\_\_\_\_\_

1.8 Do you or any of the directors / trustees / shareholders / members of the company have any interest in any other related companies whether or not they are bidding for this contract? YES NO

1.8.1 If so, furnish particulars:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Full details of directors / trustees / members / shareholders.**

See CSD report

**3. DECLARATION**

I, THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ABOVE IS CORRECT. I ACCEPT THAT THE STATE MAY REJECT THE BID OR ACT AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

## PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)

### **PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2017**

This preference form must form part of all bids invited. It contains general information and serves as a claim form for preference points for Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) Status Level of Contribution

**NB: BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM, BIDDERS MUST STUDY THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, DEFINITIONS AND DIRECTIVES APPLICABLE IN RESPECT OF B-BBEE, AS PRESCRIBED IN THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2017.**

---

#### **1. GENERAL CONDITIONS**

- 1.1 The following preference point systems are applicable to all bids:
- 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 The value of this bid is estimated to ~~exceed~~/not exceed R50,000,000 (all applicable taxes included) and therefore the 80/20 system shall be applicable. Preference points for this bid shall be awarded for:

(a) Price; and	80
(b) B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution.	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

- 1.3 Failure on the part of a bidder to submit a B-BBEE Verification Certificate from a Verification Agency accredited by the South African Accreditation System (SANAS), or a sworn affidavit confirming annual turnover and level of black ownership in case of an EME together with the bid, will be interpreted to mean that preference points for B-BBEE status level of contribution are not claimed.
- 1.4. The purchaser reserves the right to require of a bidder, either before a bid is adjudicated or at any time subsequently, to substantiate any claim in regard to preferences, in any manner required by the purchaser.

#### **2. DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 “**B-BBEE**” means broad-based black economic empowerment as defined in section 1 of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act;
- 2.2 “**B-BBEE status level of contributor**” means the B-BBEE status of an entity in terms of a code of good practice on black economic empowerment, issued in terms of section 9(1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act;
- 2.3 “**bid**” means a written offer in a prescribed or stipulated form in response to an invitation by an organ of state for the provision of services, works or goods, through price quotations, advertised competitive bidding processes or proposals;
- 2.4 “**Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act**” means the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, 2003 (Act No. 53 of 2003);
- 2.5 “**EME**” means an Exempted Micro Enterprise as defines by Codes of Good Practice under section 9 (1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act with an annual turnover up to R10 million;
- 2.6 “**functionality**” means the ability of a tenderer to provide goods or services in accordance with specifications as set out in the tender documents;
- 2.7 “**proof of B-BBEE status level of contributor**” means:
- 1) B-BBEE Status level certificate issued by an authorized body or person;
  - 2) A sworn affidavit as prescribed by the B-BBEE Codes of Good Practice;
  - 3) Any other requirement prescribed in terms of the B-BBEE Act;

**PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)**

- 2.8 “prices” includes all applicable taxes less all unconditional discounts;
- 2.9 “QSE” means a qualifying small business enterprise in terms of a code of good practice on black economic empowerment issued in terms of section 9 (1) of the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act);
- 2.10 “rand value” means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand, calculated at the time of bid invitation, and includes all applicable taxes;

**3. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE: THE 80/20 OR 90/10 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS**

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

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \mathbf{80/20 \text{ (Up to R50,000,000)}} \quad \text{Or} \quad \mathbf{90/10 \text{ (From R50,000,000)}} \\
 P_s = 80 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right) \quad \text{Or} \quad P_s = 90 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right)
 \end{array}$$

Where:

- Ps = Points scored for comparative price of bid under consideration
- Pt = Comparative price of bid under consideration
- Pmin = Comparative price of lowest acceptable bid

**4. POINTS AWARDED FOR B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION**

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

B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor	Number of points (90/10 system)	Number of points (80/20 system)
1	10	20
2	9	18
3	6	14
4	5	12
5	4	8
6	3	6
7	2	4
8	1	2
Non-compliant contributor	0	0

- 4.2 A bidder who qualifies as a EME in terms of the B-BBEE Act must submit a sworn affidavit confirming Annual Total Revenue and Level of Black Ownership. An EME automatically qualifies as a level 4 contributor. An EME with at least 75% black ownership qualifies as level 1 contributor and an EME with black ownership from 51% to 74% qualifies as a level 2 contributor.
- 4.3 A Bidder other than EME must submit their original and valid B-BBEE status level verification certificate or a certified copy thereof, substantiating their B-BBEE rating. The certificate must be issued by a Verification Agency accredited by SANAS.

**5. BID DECLARATION**

Bidders who claim points in respect of B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution must complete the following:

**6. B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION CLAIMED IN TERMS OF PARAGRAPHS 1.3 AND 5.1**

B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution: ..... = ..... (maximum of 10 or 20 points)

(Points claimed in respect of paragraph 6 must be in accordance with the table reflected in paragraph 4.1 and must be substantiated by relevant proof of B-BBEE status level of contributor.



**PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM (SBD 6.1)**

**7. SUB-CONTRACTING**

Will any portion of the contract be sub-contracted? YES / NO (delete which is not applicable). If yes, indicate:

- (I) (what percentage of the contract will be subcontracted? .....%)
- (II) the name of the sub-contractor? .....
- (III) the B-BBEE status level of the sub-contractor? .....
- (IV) whether the sub-contractor is an EME or QSE? YES / NO (delete which is not applicable)
- (V) Specify, by ticking the appropriate box, if subcontracting with an enterprise in terms of Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2017:

<b>Designated Group: An EME or QSE which is at last 51% owned by:</b>	<b>EME</b> ✓	<b>QSE</b> ✓
Black people		
Black people who are youth		
Black people who are women		
Black people with disabilities		
Black people living in rural or underdeveloped areas or townships		
Cooperative owned by black people		
Black people who are military veterans		
<b>OR</b>		
Any EME		
Any QSE		

**8. DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM**

I/we, the undersigned, who is / are duly authorised to do so on behalf of the company/firm, certify that the points claimed, based on the B-BBEE status level of contributor indicated in paragraph 6 of the foregoing certificate, qualifies the company/ firm for the preference(s) shown and I / we acknowledge that:

- (I) The information furnished (including informational SBD 1) 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 paragraph 6, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the purchaser that the claims are correct;
- (IV) If the B-BBEE status level of contribution has been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the purchaser may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –
  - (a) disqualify the person from the bidding 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) restrict the bidder or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, 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

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

**DECLARATION OF PAST SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (SBD 8)**

1. This Standard Bidding Document must form part of all bids invited.
2. It serves as a declaration to be used by institutions in ensuring that when goods and services are being procured, all reasonable steps are taken to combat the abuse of the supply chain management system.
3. The bid of any bidder may be disregarded if that bidder, or any of its directors have-
  - a. abused the institution's supply chain management system;
  - b. committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system; or
  - c. failed to perform on any previous contract.
4. In order to give effect to the above, the following questionnaire must be completed and submitted with the bid.

Item	Question	Yes	No
4.1	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the National Treasury's database as companies or persons prohibited from doing business with the public sector? <b>(Companies or persons who are listed on this database were informed in writing of this restriction by the National Treasury after the <i>audi alteram partem</i> rule was applied)</b>	Yes	No
4.1.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.2	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the Register for Tender Defaulters in terms of section 29 of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act (No 12 of 2004)? <b>(To access this Register enter the National Treasury's website, <a href="http://www.treasury.gov.za">www.treasury.gov.za</a>, click on the icon "Register for Tender Defaulters" or submit your written request for a hard copy of the Register to facsimile number (012) 3265445.</b>	Yes	No
4.2.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.3	Was the bidder or any of its directors convicted by a court of law (including a court outside of the Republic of South Africa) for fraud or corruption during the past five years?	Yes	No
4.3.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.4	Was any contract between the bidder and any organ of state terminated during the past five years on account of failure to perform on or comply with the contract?	Yes	No
4.4.1	If so, furnish particulars:		

**CERTIFICATION**

I, THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ON THIS DECLARATION FORM IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT, IN ADDITION TO CANCELLATION OF A CONTRACT, ACTION MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

**CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION (SBD 9)**

- 1 This Standard Bidding Document (SBD) must form part of all bids<sup>1</sup> invited.
- 2 Section 4 (1) (b) (iii) of the Competition Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended, prohibits an agreement between, or concerted practice by, firms, or a decision by an association of firms, if it is between parties in a horizontal relationship and if it involves collusive bidding (or bid rigging).<sup>2</sup> Collusive bidding is a *pe se* prohibition meaning that it cannot be justified under any grounds.
- 3 Treasury Regulation 16A9 prescribes that accounting officers and accounting authorities must take all reasonable steps to prevent abuse of the supply chain management system and authorizes accounting officers and accounting authorities to:
  - (a) disregard the bid of any bidder if that bidder, or any of its directors have abused the institution’s supply chain management system and or committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system.
  - (b) cancel a contract awarded to a supplier of goods and services if the supplier committed any corrupt or fraudulent act during the bidding process or the execution of that contract.
- 4 This SBD serves as a certificate of declaration that would be used by institutions to ensure that, when bids are considered, reasonable steps are taken to prevent any form of bid-rigging.
- 5 In order to give effect to the above, the attached Certificate of Bid Determination (SBD 9) must be completed and submitted with the bid:

<sup>1</sup> Includes price quotations, advertised competitive bids, limited bids and proposals.

<sup>2</sup> Bid rigging (or collusive bidding) occurs when businesses, that would otherwise be expected to compete, secretly conspire to raise prices or lower the quality of goods and / or services for purchasers who wish to acquire goods and / or services through a bidding process. Bid rigging is, therefore, an agreement between competitors not to compete.

---

I, the undersigned, in submitting the accompanying bid:

\_\_\_\_\_

(Bid Number and Description)

in response to the invitation for the bid made by:

The Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

(Name of Institution)

do hereby make the following statements that I certify to be true and complete in every respect:

I certify, on behalf of: \_\_\_\_\_ that:

(Name of Bidder)

1. I have read and I understand the contents of this Certificate;
2. I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this Certificate is found not to be true and complete in every respect;
3. I am authorised by the bidder to sign this Certificate, and to submit the accompanying bid, on behalf of the bidder;
4. Each person whose signature appears on the accompanying bid has been authorised by the bidder to determine the terms of, and to sign the bid, on behalf of the bidder;
5. For the purposes of this Certificate and the accompanying bid, I understand that the word “competitor” shall include any individual or organization, other than the bidder, whether or not affiliated with the bidder, who:
  - (a) has been requested to submit a bid in response to this bid invitation;
  - (b) could potentially submit a bid in response to this bid invitation, based on their qualifications, abilities or experience; and
  - (c) provides the same goods and services as the bidder and/or is in the same line of business as the bidder

**CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION (SBD 9)**

6. 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 consortium<sup>3</sup> will not be construed as collusive bidding.
7. In particular, without limiting the generality of paragraphs 6 above, there has been no consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor regarding:
  - (a) prices;
  - (b) geographical area where product or service will be rendered (market allocation)
  - (c) methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices;
  - (d) the intention or decision to submit or not to submit, a bid;
  - (e) the submission of a bid which does not meet the specifications and conditions of the bid; or
  - (f) bidding with the intention not to win the bid.
8. In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
9. 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.
10. 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.

Signature		Date	
Name of Signatory			
Designation of Signatory			
Name of bidder (if different)			

<sup>3</sup> 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.