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### **Background**

TIA was established to promote the development and exploitation, in the public interest, of discoveries, inventions, innovations and improvements. TIA’s objective is to support the state in stimulating and intensifying technological innovation with a view to improving economic growth and the quality of life of all South Africans.

The Agency plays a critical role in supporting the realisation of the government’s vision through funding and de-risking technological innovation and supporting the commercialisation of publicly funded intellectual property (IP), especially (but not limited to) bio-based technologies. The Agency also supports the process of knowledge use, the diffusion of existing technologies and grassroots innovators in vulnerable and marginalised communities, in this way contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

TIA also provides science, engineering and technology (SET) and enterprise development support to SMMEs and co-operatives through fostering an enabling innovation environment. In particular, the Agency supports entrepreneurs that are historically disadvantaged and marginalised (Black people, people in underserved provinces, women, youths and persons with disabilities). Through its efforts TIA seeks to alleviate poverty, inequality, and unemployment, and promote transformation and inclusion.

From a regional and international perspective, TIA plays a key facilitation role through its collaboration with research and innovation institutions across the continent and beyond through joint technology development programmes and more.

TIA remains committed to contributing to the realisation of several National Development Plan outcomes and to contribute to the realisation of the Department of Science and Innovation’s (DSI’s) Science, Technology and Innovation Decadal Plan.

**TIA Vision:** Be a leading technology innovation agency that stimulates and supports technological innovation to improve the quality of life for all South Africans.

**TIA Mission:** Facilitate the translation of South Africa’s knowledge resources into sustainable socio-economic opportunities.

*Counterfactual:* Without an entity like TIA South Africa would continue to lose opportunities resulting from the commercialisation of locally-produced IP stemming from public-funded research, development and innovation (RDI) expenditure. The benefits of exploiting such IP would continue to be lost, either through being commercialised internationally or through not being matured and de-risked sufficiently for local commercialisation.

### **Rationale**

TIA aims to use South Africa’s science and technology base and its national system of innovation (NSI) to stimulate, develop and commercialise technological innovations, enable the growth of new and existing industries, support SMEs to participate in the “innovation economy,” diversifying South Africa’s economy and ensure that innovation a key contributor to socio-economic growth and development. This in clear alignment with the goal of the DSI which is to boost socio-economic development in South Africa through research and innovation.

An institutional (TIA-level) evaluation by an expert panel was undertaken at the behest of the Minister of Higher Education, Science and Innovation in 2022. The panel found that there is a need for a clear strategic intent on the part of TIA. As part of re-imagining and repositioning the Agency, TIA has defined a strategic intent aimed at driving organisation forward. The current strategic socio-economic context calls for TIA to play a stewardship role in harnessing innovation to address the country’s economic growth and recovery efforts, the deep-rooted and intractable socio-economic challenges of poverty, inequality and unemployment, and ultimately positioning South Africa as an important and competitive player in the global economy. TIA is accordingly being called on to make a meaningful impact on the country’s socio-economic challenges through the execution of its mandate. It is therefore critical to determine what impact TIA has had broadly in society and the economy.

Since its inception, TIA has been subject to a series of reviews aimed primarily at improving and enhancing TIA as organisation within the context of improving the National System of Innovation (NSI) in South Africa. Generally reviews of public sector institutions and their performance seek answers to the broad questions:

* Is the organisation delivering on mandate and achieving results in line with the key national policies and strategies relevant to the organisation?
* What are the key factors impacting on the organisation’s mandate fulfilment and performance achievement?
* What is needed to improve the organisation and its outcomes, including consideration of whether organisation should continue exist in its current form or whether alternative institutional arrangements are necessary?

The literature on economic policy and innovation policy contends that there is a strong, positive and significant correlation between research and development (R&D) expenditure and economic growth in the long run. In the short term the effects are not easily observable as there are often significant time lags between investing in scientific research and technological development and subsequently utilising the resultant scientific and technical knowledge for economic and social gain during the commercialisation of innovation.

There are also significant variations when commercialising technological innovations in different economic sub-sectors, with digital technologies typically being the fastest to market, innovations in the productive economy (e.g. capital-intensive mining or manufacturing) being slow, and biotechnology-based innovations somewhere in between.

Furthermore, the results-based value chain (inputs -> activities -> outputs -> outcomes -> impacts) is not fully causal in relation to technological development, innovation, commercialisation and associated activities on the one hand, and resulting socio-economic impact on the other. A patent (output) may not necessarily directly result in a commercialised product or service and revenue therefrom (outcome). Also, a social or economic impact such as better living conditions through income from the sale of a new product or service may not be directly attributed to TIA’s support of technological development, innovation and entrepreneurship support. Many other factors may contribute to success or cause failure, even if there is success at a technology development and innovation level.

Nevertheless, the impact agenda (demonstrating the economic and societal relevance of investing in public-funded RDI) has become more of a focus for policymakers globally in the last few decades. Much efforts are devoted to the measurement of the impact of public funding of RDI, particularly in relation to resource (budget) allocations and setting research priorities. Furthermore, in recent years efforts by the South African government have extended to outcomes as the state has introduced and implemented an outcomes-based approach. This has been done to improve the impact of public funds beyond the traditional approach of focusing narrowly on outputs. Often these outputs do not have a demonstrable impact on economic growth and development, the improvement in social conditions, or preserving the environment.

Broadly, the impact of public-funded RDI is found across five dimensions:

* Delivering highly-skilled people to the labour market.
* Businesses improving their performance through knowledge exchange with knowledge and technology-intensive intermediaries such as technology centres, universities and public research organisations.
* The creation of new businesses, either through knowledge and technology-intensive intermediaries working with emerging businesses or through university spin-outs.
* Improving public policy and public services (e.g. the ability to predict and model flooding, building pandemic resilience and responsiveness).
* Attracting foreign direct investment in R&D from multinational corporations.

The measurement of the economic impact of investing in RDI has been of interest to TIA for many years as part of monitoring, evaluation and learning in relation to the implementation of public policy. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are key activities for any organisation which aims progressively to improve its performance. It allows for systematic learning from past and current activities – “what works/what does not work” and “why” – so that good practice can be replicated in the future and mistakes and poor outcomes avoided. This also assists in embedding a culture within an organisation which incentives the delivery of good quality performance and accountability.

### **Purpose of the Evaluation**

***The purpose of this evaluation is to undertake an outcomes and impact assessment of TIA in the period 2019/20-2023/24 to determine the extent of the Agency’s contribution to South Africa’s economy and its society.***

**Type of evaluation:** Summative; and a combination of an outcome evaluation and impact evaluation.

The results of the evaluation would constitute independently-verified evidence of TIA’s impact in the ecosystem to inform decision-making and to create awareness of the value which TIA adds to South Africa’s economy and to society. These results will be used by TIA to not only validate the Agency’s value-add in the NSI and to the public, for business development and fundraising purposes, but also by its Shareholder the DSI to motivate for increased levels of public funding. The results of this evaluation will also constitute an important baseline for the Agency to measure its performance in the future.

### **Key Evaluation Questions**

* Based on TIA’s resourcing (funds, competencies, structure and systems) is the Agency making an appropriate impact in the economy and on society? Have there been any unintended unplanned impacts, whether positive or negative?
* For TIA to make more of an impact efficiently, which changes to the Agency’s existing operating and business model should TIA consider implementing? What supplementary resourcing would be required for TIA to realise an impact with greater efficiencies? Is the quality of TIA’s interventions adequate to support the achievement of the predetermined outcomes and the observed impacts?
* Which gaps or deficiencies in the NSI exist and persist which could have been addressed or not sufficiently addressed by TIA, particularly in relation to the innovation ecosystem? What should TIA do differently which would meaningfully contribute towards a healthier NSI?
* Are TIA’s outputs and outcomes (and associated indicators and targets) appropriate in support of TIA making an optimal impact? What improvements could be made?

It should be noted that much attention has been devoted to characterising and analysing South Africa’s R&D system (“upstream” in the innovation value chain), and so this work should not focus on what is already well-understood. The work should rather focus on the innovation ecosystem (“downstream”).

For example, South Africa’s R&D system is well-balanced and very productive on a weighted basis globally. However, despite South Africa punching above its weight in terms of knowledge production (the outputs of scientific research), the utilisation or translation of this knowledge into useful or productive purposes is sub-optimal. Furthermore, spending on experimental development nationally continues to decline in proportion to spending on basic and applied research, and business expenditure on R&D is low. The venture capital landscape remains small and risk-averse, with a low appetite for a “patient capital” approach. These and other factors should be the focus of this work.

### **Scope of the Evaluation**

The planned evaluation will assess TIA’s institutional outcomes and impacts over a five-year period, specifically 2019/20-2023/24.

### **Evaluation Design**

Prospective service providers should propose an appropriate multi-method approach using both qualitative and quantitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions in Section 3 above.

#### Approach to outcome and impact measures or indicators

The core purpose of this evaluation is to determine what effect TIA has had on the economy or in society through the Agency’s support, whether financial or non-financial. Measures of indicators of outcomes and impact could include the following:

* Jobs created (direct and indirect)
* Revenue generated
* Sales created
* Export sales created
* Funding leveraged
* Follow-on funding secured
* Technologies licensed/assigned
* Spin-outs created
* Start-ups created
* JSE listings
* SMMEs supported
* Competitiveness improvements effected
* Transformation and inclusion[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Other measures of system-wide economic impact (e.g. multipliers)

**The above list is neither exhaustive nor prescriptive. Bidders need to propose what they deem to be the most appropriate metrics in terms of measuring what effect TIA has had over the last five years, selected from the above, or may propose other appropriate metrics.**

#### Benchmarking

Undertake a desktop benchmarking study to compare TIA in terms of outputs, outcomes and impacts with three other comparable innovation agencies internationally. Bidders should benchmark actual output and outcome performance and also how other agencies measure themselves in terms of outputs, outcomes and impacts, including associated indicators. (The countries selected will be agreed to in consultation with the successful service provider but would likely be drawn from the following list of countries: Brazil, India, Switzerland, Malaysia, Colombia, Singapore and Finland.)

#### Data collection

Collect data from TIA, TIA’s partners and TIA’s investees. Such data will include project reports, performance data as well as evaluation reports.

#### Case studies

Identify notable project successes and failures and undertake at least two case studies (one success and one failure) detailing the socio-economic impact of successful projects and lessons learnt.

### **Deliverables Expected from the Evaluation**

The required activities to be undertaken to complete the evaluation are as follows:

* + Inception report as a follow-up and response to the initial proposal with an updated project plan, overall evaluation approach, design, detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. The inception report needs to be approved by TIA before commencement of work.
	+ Final piloted data collection instruments, analysis plan and other tools.
	+ Mid-term report.
	+ Case studies.
	+ Benchmarking report.
	+ Draft report, in electronic format.
	+ Final report in 1/3/25[[2]](#footnote-2) electronic format.
	+ The provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation.

It should be noted that the interim and final outputs of this evaluation will be used as inputs into TIA’s strategic planning process. In addition to submission of the above deliverables, the successful bidder will be required to deliver in-person audio-visual presentations of the various reports and deliver brief progress updates on an agreed schedule.

TIA reserves the right to appoint an independent expert reviewer or reviewers to support the body of work and verify that the draft final report produced by the bidder complies with and satisfies the objectives and requirements of this specification. TIA may require the bidder to make any necessary revisions to the draft final report based on the inputs of the expert(s).

### **Structure and Contents of Proposal to be Submitted**

TIA invites experienced bidders to submit proposals in response to the scope of work as contained in this document. Proposals are to be prepared and submitted at the bidder’s own cost.

Proposals (*one single document which should be limited to 30 pages*, excluding appendices and attachments) shall have the following sections:

1. Introduction and organisational overview.
2. Understanding of the work required, the science, technology and innovation (STI) policy context within which the work will be undertaken and the impact agenda in relation to public-funded agencies.
3. Experience and competence, including:
4. An overview of experience and competence in undertaking evaluations in the fields of socio-economic development, STI policy and industrial policy.
5. An overview of experience and competence in evaluation methodologies such as quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, tools and techniques and experience in designing and applying them.
6. A list of the bidder’s team members together with their areas of expertise, their roles in the evaluation and quantified level of effort in the evaluation per activity. The bid company’s team should preferably be led by a person with expertise in STI policy evaluations, policy analysis or equivalent. This person must have suitable qualifications, demonstrable experience in undertaking similar evaluation, and must also contribute a significant portion of his/her time to undertaking and guiding the evaluation.
7. Approach, design and methodology (e.g. literature and documentation review, data sampling approach, analytical frameworks, data collection, tools, suggestions for elaboration or changes to evaluation questions, scope and methodology as outlined in this ToR).
8. Activity-based project plan to render the required services, making provision for unforeseen circumstances to ensure the plan is achievable.
9. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality).
10. High-level budget/costing (in South African Rand, including VAT), linked to the proposed activities and proportional time commitments of team members.

Proposal appendices as follows:

1. A list (title of work and name of client) of *all* evaluation work (i.e. evaluations of a general nature not relating to R&D and innovation) which lasted 6 months or more undertaken in the last three years.
2. A summary of all *relevant* evaluations (i.e. relating to R&D and innovation) (½ page each) which lasted 6 months or more undertaken in the last five years. This summary should include the title of project, a brief summary of the work and a list of the bidder’s team members involved in this work, indicating the approximate contribution (to the nearest 10%) of each team member.
3. Resumes of key individuals proposed for the work. (Note that bidders may be required to furnish proof of contracts with any individuals who are not already staff members of the bidding company.)
4. Provide five reference letters in relation to relevant work undertaken in the last five years. **Note: Bidders who do not submit any reference letters will be disqualified.**
5. Provide five examples of relevant evaluation reports produced in the last five years in electronic format. **Note: Bidders who do not submit any sample reports/case studies will be disqualified.**

Should any of the key service provider’s personnel be replaced or changed, TIA shall be advised. Any replacement key personnel shall be at an equivalent or higher competency/skill level, and TIA reserves the right to assess the same and request changes to the replacement personnel if it deems such changes insufficient.

### **Key Background Documents**

Core documents

* Technology Innovation Agency Act (26 of 2008)
* Establishment of the Technology Innovation Agency (TIA) Business Case (2008)[[3]](#footnote-3)
* Review of the Technology Innovation Agency (2013)3
* White Paper on Science and Technology (1996)
* The role and efficiency of the Technology Innovation Agency in the commercialisation and development of intellectual property from publicly-funded institutions, a.k.a. National Treasury Spending Review (2021)3
* Report of the TIA 2022 Review Panel: Supplementary Work to Complete the Institutional Review of the Technology Innovation Agency, a.k.a. TIA Ministerial Review (2022)3
* Science, Technology and Innovation Decadal Plan (2022)
* TIA 2.0: Informing a Strategy for TIA that responds to the Ministerial Review, Towards a re-imagination and re-positioning of TIA within South Africa’s National System of Innovation, a.k.a. TIA Review Management Response and Action Plan (2023)3

M&E-related frameworks:

* National Treasury’s *Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information*
* Department Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation’s (DPME’s) *Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System*
* DPME’s *National Evaluation Policy Framework*
* DPME’s *Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans* and associated *Guidelines for Implementation of the Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans*
* National Advisory Council on Innovation’s *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the South African Science, Technology and Innovation System*

Supplementary documents:

* National Research and Development Strategy (2002)
* OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: South Africa (2007)
* Intellectual Property Rights from Publicly Financed Research and Development Act (2008)
* Ten-Year Innovation Plan (2008)
* Science and Technology Laws Amendment Act (No 7 of 2014).
* South African National Survey of Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer at Publicly Funded Research Institutions Inaugural Baseline Study: 2008-2014 (2017)
* Review of the South African Science, Technology and Innovation Institutional Landscape (2017)
* Towards a Next-Generation Science, Technology and Innovation White Paper for South Africa: Performance Analysis (2017)
* Towards a Next-Generation Science, Technology and Innovation White Paper for South Africa: Innovation for Transformative Change and Inclusive Development Situational Analysis (2017)
* White Paper on Science, Technology and Innovation (2019)
* Science and Technology Laws Amendment Act (No 9 of 2020).
* Review of the National Research and Development Strategy and the Ten-Year Innovation Plan (2020)
* Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation Institutional Landscape (HESTIIL) review (2021)
* South African National Survey of Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer at Publicly Funded Research Institutions Second National Survey: 2014-2018 (2021)
* Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators (annual reports)
* National Research and Development Survey (annual reports)

Other documents will be made available to the preferred service provider upon appointment, which are part of ongoing separate projects, and which should not be costed or included in the proposed work to be done:

* TIA benchmarking study tour reports.
* TIA programme evaluation reports.
* TIA Commercialisation Enablement Strategy.

### **Intellectual Property Rights and Data Ownership**

All foreground intellectual property emanating from this evaluation shall become the property of TIA. All background intellectual property shall remain the property of the respective party. All datasets, metadata and survey documentation shall be handed over to TIA upon conclusion of the work and shall be considered the property of TIA.

### **Bibliography**
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### **Important Notices**

* Bidders are required to attend a compulsory briefing session (via Microsoft Teams) on **3 June 2024 at 14:00.**
* Bidders who meet the minimum requirements of phase one of the functional evaluation (evaluation of written proposals) will be invited to phase two of the functional evaluation to deliver an audio-visual presentation (via Microsoft Teams).
* Bidders that met minimum qualifying score on phase will be contacted four (4) days before the actual presentation date.
* Proposals reflecting the Request for Proposals reference number must be e-mailed to Tenders@tia.org.za by 20 June 2024 at 14:00. **Included in this submission must be the presentation to be delivered to TIA should the prospective bidder meet the minimum requirements of phase one of the functional evaluation (evaluation of written proposals)** and progress to phase two of the functional evaluation (evaluation of audio-visual presentations).
* Proposals not received by TIA by the due date and time will not be considered.
* Please note that TIA’s servers will block any file greater than 200MB. If your proposal is greater than 200MB you are advised to divide your submission into parts that are equal or less than 200MB and state on the subject ‘Part 1, Part 2, Part 3’ etc.
* The name of files submitted should be no longer than 50 characters. Longer file names creates challenges transmitting these files internally and storing these on TIA’s servers.
* The cost for the work shall be based on the “Guidelines for fees” issued by the South African Institute of Chartered Accountants and set out in the “Guide of Hourly Fees Rates for Consultants” issued by the Department of Public Service and Administration or prescribed by the body regulating the profession of the consultant.
* TIA reserves the right to not consider proposals which do not adhere to the minimum requirements as contained in this document. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
	+ Maximum 30-page main proposal (excluding appendices).
	+ Main proposal must be one single document, not a collection of individual documents.
	+ Proposal to adhere to the specified section headings.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### First Stage: Functionality/Technical Evaluation

| **Categories and criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Team Capability** (Specific experience and expertise of the core team in relation to the field of work as per bullet 3.c. in Section 8.)

**Score:**5 = Resumes indicate 10 years or more of relevant experience.4 = Resumes indicate 6-10 years of relevant experience.3 = Resumes indicate 3-6 years of relevant experience.2 = Resumes indicate 1-3 years of relevant experience.1 = Resumes indicate less than 1 year of relevant experience.0 = Experience not specified or unclear.(Years of experience of a team will be the average of each person’s experience. **Note: Resumes need to be clear concerning quantifiable years of relevant experience.**) | ***0.3*** | ***5*** |
| 1. **Client references** (Track record of the bidder over the last five years through the provision of reference letters indicating positive feedback.)

**Score:**5 = 5 reference letters with positive feedback.4 = 4 reference letters with positive feedback.3 = 3 reference letters with positive feedback.2 = 2 reference letters with positive feedback. 1 = 1 reference letters with positive feedback.0 = no reference letters provided. ***Note: Bidders who do not submit any reference letters will be disqualified.*** | ***0.2*** | ***5*** |
| 1. **Quality of proposal** (Quality of the proposal in terms of: 1) a sufficiently detailed and high-quality activity-based plan aligned with activities and deliverables, 2) full understanding of the work required, 3) an appropriate approach, design and methodology proposed for the work, 4) meets all the specific requirements\* of the proposal and 5) a professionally laid up, well-written (minimal typos and grammatical errors) and logically-structured proposal.)

**Score:**5 = A proposal that meets all five proposal quality requirements.4 = A proposal that meets four of the five proposal quality requirements.3 = A proposal that meets three of the five proposal quality requirements.2 = A proposal that meets two of the five proposal quality requirements.1 = A proposal that meets one of the five proposal quality requirements.0 = A proposal that does not meet any of the five proposal quality requirements.\* A proposal that has no more than 30 pages (excl. appendices and attachments), a single proposal document, with the required proposal sections as stipulated. | ***0.3*** | 5 |
| 1. **Understanding of the National System of Innovation**

**Score:**5 = 4 and can describe how the South African NSI relates to other key policy areas (economic, social and environmental) and the global context.4 = 3 and can describe the main dynamics, strengths and weaknesses within the South African NSI.3 = Is able to describe the main organisations, institutions, policies and processes of the South African NSI and how they relate.2 = Is able to list the main organisations, institutions, policies and processes in the South African NSI.1 = Describes only a narrow set of features of the South African NSI.0 = No information provided or irrelevant/incorrect understanding. | ***0.1*** | 5 |
| 1. **Quality and relevance of submitted example evaluation reports\* relevant to the scope of work required** (Demonstrated high-quality experience in at least five related evaluations undertaken in last 5 years)

**Score:**5 = High-quality reports which are highly relevant to the scope of work.4 = Above-average quality reports which are predominantly relevant to the scope of work3 = Adequate quality reports which are partially relevant to the scope of work.2 = Below-average quality reports which are marginally relevant to the scope of work.1 = Poor quality reports which are mostly irrelevant to the scope of work.0 = No reports provided.***Note: Bidders must submit at least one sample evaluation report, failing which they will be disqualified. Should issues of client confidentiality prevent bidders from providing sample evaluation reports and it is not possible to provide even redacted sample evaluation reports, bidders may provide substantial summaries of evaluation studies instead. However, in such instances these summaries must be approved/signed by one of the bidder’s directors, executives or equivalent, and also be directly related to the provided client reference letter(s) (criteria 2 above).***\* Evaluation studies which are in the public domain, or where permission has been obtained from previous clients by the bidder to make such reports available to TIA only for the purpose of assessing their proposals, whether in the original presentation or with sections redacted. | ***0.1*** | 5 |
| **Total weighted score/Maximum possible score** | ***1.0*** |  |
| **Minimum qualifying score (expressed as percentage)** |  | **70%** |

#### Second Stage: Audio-visual Presentation

Subject to meeting the minimum score of 70% for the evaluation of written proposals, bidders will proceed to the second stage of the evaluation entailing presenting their proposals to TIA. Here bidders will have the opportunity to showcase their understanding of the work required and expand on the envisaged project plan. The presentation will be made via Microsoft Teams and shall last no more than **45 minutes (including time for questions)**. Bidders are advised to structure their presentation according to the evaluation criteria below.

| **Evaluation criteria** | **Scoring** |
| --- | --- |
| Understanding of the work required, including the STI policy context within which the work will be undertaken and the impact agenda in relation to public-funded agencies | 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor; 0 = Unacceptable |
| Understanding of project objectives and deliverables based on presenting a project plan with deliverables and timeframes, clearly stating how the project will be coordinated from inception to completion. | 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor; 0 = Unacceptable |
| Interpretation of the brief and expectations (this request for bids). | 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor; 0 = Unacceptable |
| Quality and professionalism of the presentation made (standard of the Powerpoint presentation, delivery of the presentation and responding to questions), including timekeeping. | 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor; 0 = Unacceptable |

The weighting is equal across all the evaluation criteria.

**The minimum qualifying score (expressed as percentage) for presentations is 70%.**

#### Third Stage: Specific Goals - Please note that preference point system (80/20 will be used as prescribed in terms of the PPPFA.

Subject to meeting the minimum score of 70% for the evaluation of audio-visual presentations, the two highest-scoring bidders will proceed to the third stage of the evaluation and will be evaluated further based on TIA’s Specific Goals system as below.

| **Specific Goal** | **Points** | **Proof** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| At least 51% Black ownershipLess than 51% Black ownership | 100 | Share register or Central Supplier Database report |
| At least 50% of project team comprises of black women professionals.Less than 50% of project team comprises of black women professionals  | 50 | ID (card or booklet) |
| At least 1 position in the project team is given to a young professional (that is under 35 years old)No young professional that is under 35  | 50 | ID (card or booklet) |
| **Total points for specific goals** | **20** |
| **Price** | **80** | **Quotation** |
| **Total** | **100** |

### **Mandatory Requirements**

* Provision of at least one reference letter in relation to relevant work undertaken in the last five years.
* Provision of at least one relevant evaluation report produced in the last five years. ***Or*** the provision of substantial summaries of evaluation studies, which must be approved/signed by one of the bidder’s directors, executives or equivalent, and also be directly related to the provided client reference letters.
* The service provider needs to be registered on government’s Central Supplier Database ([www.csd.gov.za](http://www.csd.gov.za)) and be tax compliant by the time TIA appoints.

### **General terms and conditions**

* The Respondent is responsible for all costs incurred in the preparation and submission of the proposal

Kindly note that TIA is entitled to:

* Amend any RFP conditions, validity period, specifications, or extend the closing date and/or time of RFPs before the closing date. All Respondents, to whom the RFP documents have been issued, will be advised in writing of such amendments in good time;
* Verify any information contained in a proposal;
* Not to appoint any bidder;
* Vary, alter, and/or amend the terms of this RFP, at any time prior to the finalisation of its adjudication hereof;
* An omission to disclose material information, a factual inaccuracy, and/or a misrepresentation of fact may result in the disqualification of a proposal, or cancellation of any subsequent contract.
* TIA reserves the right not to accept the lowest proposal or any proposal in part or in whole. TIA normally awards the contract to the Bidder who proves to be fully capable of handling the contract and whose Proposal is technically acceptable and/or financially advantageous to TIA. Appointment as a successful contractor shall be subject to the parties agreeing to mutually acceptable contractual terms and conditions. In the event of the parties failing to reach such agreement within 30 days from the appointment date, TIA shall be entitled to appoint the contractor who was rated second, and so on.
* TIA also reserves the right to award this RFP as a whole or in part without furnishing reasons.
* TIA also reserves the right to cancel or withdraw from this RFP as a whole or in part without furnishing reasons and without attracting any liability.
* The Bidder hereby offers to render all of the services described in the attached documents (if any) to TIA on the terms and conditions and in accordance with the specifications stipulated in this RFP documents (and which shall be taken as part of, and incorporated into, this proposal at the prices inserted therein).
* This proposal and its acceptance shall be subject to the terms and conditions contained in this RFP document.
* **The Respondent shall prepare for a possible presentation should TIA require such and the Respondent shall be notified thereof no later than 4 (four) days before the actual presentation date.**
* Validity period: 120 days after closing date
* Failure to comply with any of the terms and conditions as set out above will invalidate the Proposal.
* TIA’s decision on proposals received shall be final and binding

**SBD1: PART A**

**INVITATION TO BID**

|  |
| --- |
| **YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO BID FOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE (***NAME OF DEPARTMENT/ PUBLIC ENTITY***)** |
| BID NUMBER: |  | CLOSING DATE: |  | CLOSING TIME: |  |
| DESCRIPTION |  |
| **BID RESPONSE DOCUMENTS MAY BE DEPOSITED IN THE BID BOX SITUATED AT *(STREET ADDRESS)*** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **BIDDING PROCEDURE ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO** | **TECHNICAL ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:** |
| CONTACT PERSON |  | CONTACT PERSON |  |
| TELEPHONE NUMBER |  | TELEPHONE NUMBER |  |
| FACSIMILE NUMBER |  | FACSIMILE NUMBER |  |
| E-MAIL ADDRESS |  | E-MAIL ADDRESS |  |
| **SUPPLIER INFORMATION** |
| NAME OF BIDDER |  |
| POSTAL ADDRESS |  |
| STREET ADDRESS |  |
| TELEPHONE NUMBER | CODE |  | NUMBER |  |
| CELLPHONE NUMBER |  |
| FACSIMILE NUMBER | CODE |  | NUMBER |  |
| E-MAIL ADDRESS |  |
| VAT REGISTRATION NUMBER |  |
| SUPPLIER COMPLIANCE STATUS | TAX COMPLIANCE SYSTEM PIN: |  | **OR** | CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE No:  | MAAA |
| B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE | TICK APPLICABLE BOX][ ]  Yes [ ]  No | B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL SWORN AFFIDAVIT  | [TICK APPLICABLE BOX][ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
| ***[A B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL VERIFICATION CERTIFICATE/ SWORN AFFIDAVIT (FOR EMES & QSEs) MUST BE SUBMITTED IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR PREFERENCE POINTS FOR B-BBEE]*** |
| ARE YOU THE ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA FOR THE GOODS /SERVICES /WORKS OFFERED? | [ ] Yes [ ] No [IF YES ENCLOSE PROOF] | ARE YOU A FOREIGN BASED SUPPLIER FOR **THE GOODS /SERVICES /WORKS OFFERED?** | [ ] Yes [ ] No[IF YES, ANSWER THE QUESTIONNAIRE BELOW ] |
| **QUESTIONNAIRE TO BIDDING FOREIGN SUPPLIERS** |
| IS THE ENTITY A RESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA)? [ ]  YES [ ]  NODOES THE ENTITY HAVE A BRANCH IN THE RSA? [ ]  YES [ ]  NODOES THE ENTITY HAVE A PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT IN THE RSA? [ ]  YES [ ]  NODOES THE ENTITY HAVE ANY SOURCE OF INCOME IN THE RSA? [ ]  YES [ ]  NOIS THE ENTITY LIABLE IN THE RSA FOR ANY FORM OF TAXATION? [ ]  YES [ ]  NO **IF THE ANSWER IS “NO” TO ALL OF THE ABOVE, THEN IT IS NOT A REQUIREMENT TO REGISTER FOR A TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS SYSTEM PIN CODE FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVENUE SERVICE (SARS) AND IF NOT REGISTER AS PER 2.3 BELOW.**  |

**PART B**

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR BIDDING**

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

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

SIGNATURE OF BIDDER: ……………………………………………

CAPACITY UNDER WHICH THIS BID IS SIGNED: ……………………………………………

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

DATE: …………………………………………...

**SBD 4**

**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.

1. **Bidder’s declaration**

2.1 Is the bidder, or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest[[4]](#footnote-4) in the enterprise,

 employed by the state? **YES/NO**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Full Name** | **Identity Number** | **Name of State institution** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

2.2

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

2.2.1 If so, furnish particulars:

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

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

* + 1. If so, furnish particulars:

…………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………….

1. **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 consortium[[5]](#footnote-5) will not be construed as collusive bidding.

3.4In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications, prices, including methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices, market allocation, the intention or decision to submit or not to submit the bid, bidding with the intention not to win the bid and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.

3.4 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.

3.5 There have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements made by the bidder with any official of the procuring institution in relation to this procurement process prior to and during the bidding process except to provide clarification on the bid submitted where so required by the institution; and the bidder was not involved in the drafting of the specifications or terms of reference for this bid.

* 1. 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

**SBD 6.1**

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

 (*delete whichever is not applicable for this tender*).

1. The applicable preference point system for this tender is the 90/10 preference point system.
2. The applicable preference point system for this tender is the 80/20 preference point system.
3. 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. Points for this tender (even in the case of a tender for income-generating contracts) shall be awarded for:
4. Price; and
5. Specific Goals.
	1. **To be completed by the organ of state:**

The maximum points for this tender are allocated as follows:

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

* 1. 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.
	2. 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.
1. **DEFINITIONS**
2. **“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;
3. **“price”** means an amount of money tendered for goods or services, andincludes all applicable taxes less all unconditional discounts;
4. **“rand value”** means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand, calculated at the time of bid invitation, and includes all applicable taxes;
5. **“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
6. **“the Act”** means the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act, 2000 (Act No. 5 of 2000).
7. **FORMULAE FOR PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES**
	1. **POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE**

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

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

 **80/20 or 90/10**

or

 Where

 Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

 Pt = Price of tender under consideration

 Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

* 1. **FORMULAE FOR DISPOSAL OR LEASING OF STATE ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING PROCUREMENT**
		1. **POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE**

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

 **80/20 or 90/10**

or

Where

 Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

 Pt = Price of tender under consideration

 Pmax = Price of highest acceptable tender

1. **POINTS AWARDED FOR SPECIFIC GOALS**
	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:
	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—
2. 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

1. 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)** |
| At least 51% Black ownershipLess than 51% Black ownership |  | 100 |  |  |
| At least 50% of project team comprises of black women professionals.Less than 50% of project team comprises of black and women professionals  |  | 50 |  |  |
| At least 1 position in the project team is given to a young professional (that is under 35 years old)No young professional that is under 35  |  | 50 |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

 **DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM**

* 1. Name of company/firm…………………………………………………………………….
	2. Company registration number: …………………………………………………………...
	3. 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]

* 1. 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:
1. The information furnished is true and correct;
2. The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form;
3. 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;
4. 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 –
	1. disqualify the person from the tendering process;
	2. recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person’s conduct;
	3. 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;
	4. 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
	5. forward the matter for criminal prosecution, if deemed necessary.

……………………………………….

**SIGNATURE(S) OF TENDERER(S)**

**SURNAME AND NAME**: ……………………………………………………….

**DATE:** ………………………………………………………

**ADDRESS**: ………………………………………………………

 ………………………………………………………

 ………………………………………………………

 ………………………………………………………

1. Participation of black people, women, youth and persons with disabilities, improved reach to underserved provinces and municipalities. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A report consisting of a summary for policy-makers (±1 page), an executive summary (±3 pages) and a broader report outline (max. 25 pages), plus appendices. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To be made available via a secure read-only web portal to those who attend the mandatory briefing session, subject to entering into a non-disclosure agreement. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)