



REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ)

OPENING DATE	04/08/2026
CLOSING DATE AND TIME	21/08/2026 @11h00
QUOTATION NUMBER	MBTC-SCM/118/2026
TELEPHONE	069 831 8200
E-MAIL	scm@mandelabaytheatre.co.za
ENQUIRIES	Thembela Liwani
SUPPLIER DETAILS	
NAME OF SUPPLIER	
CONTACT PERSON	
TELEPHONE	
EMAIL ADDRESS	
ADDRESS	
THE UNDERNEATH SPECIAL CONDITIONS ARE TO BE ADHERED TO, FAILURE TO COMPLY WILL RESULT IN IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION.	
SPECIAL CONDITIONS:	a) It is COMPULSORY for the suppliers to complete the MBTC RFQ forms and to attach valid quotations of the company with a letterhead. b) The price must be V.A.T. inclusive. c) Price must include delivery. d) Supplier to adhere to the closing date and time of the quotation request. e) Quotation must be valid for a period of 90 days. f) Supplier must break down the prices when quoting. g) Complete the attached SBD 4, SBD 6.1 h) Evaluation criteria: 80/20 i) No prepayment/upfront payment will be paid by Mandela Bay Theatre Complex. j) CSD registration is COMPULSORY Quotations can be e-mailed back to: scm@mandelabaytheatre.co.za l) For hand delivery: 68 Cape Road, Gqeberha



REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ)

		Att. Ms. Thembela Liwani		
		Please provide the CSD Supplier number: <u>MAAA</u>		
SPECIFICATION : CONFLICT OF INTEREST				
No.		Quantity	Unit Price	Total Price
	<i>Terms of Reference attached</i>			
<u>Total</u>				
<u>VAT (only if VAT registered)</u>				
<u>Total Price incl/excl Vat</u>				

QUOTATION REQUEST

1. Is the Price Firm.....Yes/No



sport, arts & culture

Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**MANDELA BAY
THEATRE COMPLEX**
AN AGENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
SPORT, ARTS AND CULTURE

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ)

2. Is the Delivery Firm.....Yes/No
3. Is the offer strictly to specification if No state deviation?

Signature.....

Company Stamp and Date

SCOPE OF WORK/SPECIFICATION

1. BACKGROUND

The Mandela Bay Theatre Complex (MTBC) is responsible for arts and culture, a mandate that is derived from the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. To execute this mandate, the MTBC is guided by and must comply with both external and internal legislative frameworks. This mandate is executed guided by a number of values, including the values of honesty, fairness, transparency and the highest ethical standards. This commits the employees of MTBC to preserve the highest standards of personal honesty and exemplary moral character. As part of its commitment to high ethical standards, the MTBC is compelled to properly investigate allegations of fraud, corruption, maladministration or any other malfeasance.

In terms of the institutional arrangement, the Audit Committee (AC) is mandated by the Council to investigate matters within its power and mandate. From time to time, the AC acquires the services of external service providers to deliver on its mandate. Thus, professional service providers are hereby requested to provide quotations for the provision of investigation services.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Request for Quotations (RFQ) is to request a prospective service provider with the prerequisite skills and capacity to quote for alleged conflict of interest investigation services. The prospective service provider will be required to provide services within the desired quality, scope, timeframe, and cost. The service provider is also requested to submit a detailed methodology that will be used to guide the investigation.

3. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this RFQ are to:

- a. Appoint a service provider to conduct an investigation into the allegations of conflict of interest and the possible irregular expenditure condonement matter.
- b. Conduct an independent and impartial investigation into the allegations of conflict of interest
- c. Determine whether an actual, perceived, or potential conflict of interest existed and assess the extent to which it may have influenced decision-making processes
- d. Establish the facts and circumstances surrounding the allegations through the collection, analysis, and verification of relevant evidence and information

Provide recommendations for corrective action, disciplinary measures, recovery of losses, and improvements to internal controls and governance processes to prevent similar occurrences in the future

4. SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

- 4.1 The preferred service provider will be required to obtain and review all relevant documents/records as may be obtained from whatever relevant source (internal or external) and conduct investigations into the relocation accommodation for the period January 2024 to November 2024 to:
 - a. Establish whether any staff member of the MBTC is connected to any service provider used for the relocation accommodation and determine whether any conflicts of interest (real, perceived, or potential) existed as a result of such connectedness.
 - b. In an event where a conflict of interest existed, to:
 - determine the nature of the conflict, and whether this was declared by the relevant employee in terms of the applicable legislative framework;

- determine whether any collusion existed between MBTC's employees, the travel agent responsible for resettlement accommodation for MBTC staff and the service providers selected to provide the accommodation services;
 - Quantify any misuse of funds or losses incurred by the MTBC due to uneconomic procurement practices or any other means and identify responsibility;
 - Identify process/internal control weaknesses; and
 - Recommend appropriate actions where wrongdoing has occurred or internal control deficiencies have been identified.
- c. Establish whether the relocation accommodation was procured and related costs were in line with the procedures and/or authorities prescribed in the relevant laws, regulations and policies;
- in an event where relocation accommodation was not procured, or costs incurred, in compliance with the legislative framework, determine the extent of such non-compliance and quantify the costs thereof.
 - Establish if there is any kind of unauthorized, irregular, wasteful and fruitless expenditure.
 - Report on the findings and provide recommendations to deal with the internal control gaps.
- d. The relevant expert or function should be appointed to perform the determination test on the possible Irregular Expenditure Condonement matter as provided in Section 4.13 of the National Treasury instruction note 4 of 2022/2023 that ""A determination test must be conducted by the loss control function or another relevant function to examine and analyse particulars of confirmed amounts of unauthorised, irregular or fruitless and wasteful expenditure to establish facts related to the expenditure and any losses incurred".
- e. The expert must disclose the irregular expenditure, whether condoned or not, in accordance with PFMA and GRAP requirements.
- f. The expert must review the evidence of approval regarding the extension of accommodation.
- g. The expert must investigate if the special telephonic request for a "2-bedroom, 2-bathroom Seaview unit, inclusive of dinner, bed, and breakfast" formed part of the approval.
- h. The expert must provide recommendations to the Council based on the applicable regulations and legislation.

5. DELIVERABLES

The preferred service provider will be required to:

- a. Prepare an engagement plan and budget with clear timelines and deliverables based on the agreed scope;
- b. Project plan, including task definition and allocation, project timeframes/timetable and milestones as well as feedback and reporting plan;
- c. Conduct the investigation within the prescripts of the law, using acceptable approaches, methodologies, tools, and techniques as deemed appropriate, including but not limited to polygraph tests;
- d. Provide progress reports to the Chairperson of the Audit Committee (AC) and, where deemed appropriate, to the AC;
- e. Present the draft report to the AC;
- f. Present the final report to the AC and any structure as determined by the AC;
- g. Report on the identified vulnerabilities, threats and any deficiency in internal control and make recommendations on improvements;
- h. Present properly referenced evidence files;
- i. Assist the MTBC with laying of criminal charges and liaison with law enforcement agencies, where criminal conduct has been identified; and

- j. Lead evidence on behalf of the MTBC in any disciplinary/criminal proceedings based on investigation findings.

6. TEAM MEMBERS

Details of the key team member/s to be assigned to the project should be submitted in the following format, together with their **CVs and certified copies of their qualifications and certifications for evaluation**. Failure to submit CVs and certified copies of qualifications, resources will not be considered.

Name	Role in the Project	Qualification	Certification	Years of Experience in investigation of Conflict of interest

EVALUATION CRITERIA/FUNCTIONALITY

Only responsive service providers scoring a minimum of 40 points for functionality shall proceed to final stage for Price and BBBEE. TOTAL points = 50

Evaluation criteria/ functionality

CRITERIA		MAXIMUM TO BE AWARDED	
Requirements			
1. Team Competencies			Max Points
1.1 Collective forensic investigation/ investigations experience of the proposed key team (Fair spread across all levels of the team)			10 Points
- More than 30 years - Between 20 to 30 years - Between 10 to 20 years - Less than 10 years	10 points 6 points 3 points 0 points		
1.2 Qualifications: Fair spread across all levels of the proposed key team			5 Points
- At least 40 % of team members with a post graduate degree in either forensic investigation, law or auditing/ internal auditing. - More than 70% of members with a bachelor's degree in either forensic investigation, law or auditing/internal auditing. - Less than 70% of team members with a bachelor's degree in either forensic investigation, law or auditing/internal auditing.	5 points 2 points 0 points		
1.3 Professional Certification: Fair spread across all levels of the key team			10 Points

	• More than 70 % of team members are Certified Fraud Examiners (CFEs) or any other recognized professional certification in fraud examination (CFE/CIA/CA (SA)/ICFP) • 30 to 70 % of team members are CFEs or any other recognized professional certification in fraud examination (CFE/CIA/CA(SA)/ICFP) • Less than 30 % of team members are CFE or any other recognized professional certification in fraud examination (CFE/CIA/CA(SA)/ICFP)	10 points	
		5 points	
		0 points	
1.4 Professional Membership: Fair spread across all levels of the key team			5 Points
	• More than 90 % of team members are members of professional body (i.e. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Institute of Commercial Forensic Practitioners, PSIRA or IIA) • 50 to 90% of team members are members of professional bodies (i.e. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Institute of Commercial Forensic Practitioners, PSIRA or IIA) • Less than 50% of team members are members of professional bodies (i.e. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Institute of Commercial Forensic Practitioners, PSIRA or IIA)	5 points	
		2 points	
		0 points	
Only service providers affiliated with the professional bodies listed above will be considered.			
2. Proposed methodology and approach			15 points
	Understanding of the requirements, including the following phases as a minimum: Preliminary evaluation, Planning and Scoping, Fieldwork, Reporting and Project quality management.		
	Fully meets and exceeds expectations: Written proposal that demonstrates exceptional understanding of the MTBC context and allegations; provides a clear, detailed methodology (including, but not limited to evidence-gathering, interview strategy, forensic auditing, conflict-of-interest testing, document review and verification). The written proposal presents a well-structured work plan and realistic timelines; shows robust governance and peer review, identifies risks and mitigation tailored to the assignment.	15 points	
	Meets the requirements with minor weaknesses: A written proposal that demonstrates good understanding, solid methodology with minor gaps, generally realistic work plan, adequate quality assurance and risk management, and mostly addresses key components of these criteria	10 points	
CRITERIA		MAXIMUM TO BE AWARDED	

Partially meets the requirements but has material weaknesses: - Basic or generic understanding; functional but high-level Methodology, vague or unrealistic work plan, limited quality assurance and risk management, and insufficient adaptation to MTBC context. Does not meet requirements: - Submitted methodology is unclear, incomplete, outdated, irrelevant, or missing: 0–2 points depending on severity.	5 points 0-2 points	
3. Company experience		5 Points
Bidder must submit reference letters demonstrating performance of fraud or forensic investigations related to any of the following: conflict of interest, procurement irregularities, and governance breaches to score points. Reference letters must be in a company letterhead and signed, for points to be awarded. 10 or more reference letters in 5-9 reference letters 1-4 reference letters 0 reference letters Attach reference letters/testimonials not older than 5 years on company letterhead and signed. Include: organisation name, nature and scope of the investigation, contact person details, contract amount (or award letter if amount not stated), period of engagement, outcomes/deliverables achieved. No points will be allocated where the reference letters do not address all of the specified areas above.	5 points 3 points 2 points 0 points	
TOTAL = 50 points		

EVALUATION USING A POINTS SYSTEM, PRICE & BEE

PRICE SCHEDULE

The service providers should provide their quotations guided by the requirements in the table below. **Failure to price as per the estimated hours in the table below will result in the disqualification of the service provider.**

Position	Estimated Hours*	Rate per Hour	Price "R"
Project Director	10		
Senior Manager	20		
Audit Manager	30		
Auditors	50		
Sub-Total			
Disbursements			
VAT			
Total Price			

*Estimated hours are for comparability purposes only. The final number of hours will be agreed during project initiation and may not exceed the quoted totals without prior written approval from MTBC.

The RFQ will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- a. Suitability of the investigation methodology;**
- b. Suitability of skills of the investigation team to deliver on the investigation scope and objectives;**
- c. Quality management;**
- d. Previous project/s of a similar nature; and**
- e. Quoted price.**

BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE

1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

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

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

2. Bidder's declaration

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

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

Full Name	Identity Number	Name of State institution

- 2.2 Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have a relationship

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

with any person who is employed by the procuring institution? **YES/NO**

2.2.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

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

2.3.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

3 DECLARATION

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

- 3.1 I have read and I understand the contents of this disclosure;
- 3.2 I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this disclosure is found not to be true and complete in every respect;
- 3.3 The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor. However, communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium² will not be construed as collusive bidding.
- 3.4 In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications, prices, including methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices, market allocation, the intention or decision to submit or not to submit the bid, bidding with the intention not to win the bid and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
- 3.4 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.
- 3.5 There have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements made by the bidder with any official of the procuring

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

institution in relation to this procurement process prior to and during the bidding process except to provide clarification on the bid submitted where so required by the institution; and the bidder was not involved in the drafting of the specifications or terms of reference for this bid.

- 3.6 I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms of section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

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

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

.....	
Signature	Date
.....	
Position	Name of bidder

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

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

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

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

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

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

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

(delete whichever is not applicable for this tender).

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

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

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

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

The maximum points for this tender are allocated as follows:

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

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

2. DEFINITIONS

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

3. FORMULAE FOR PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

3.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

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

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

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

Where

- Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
- Pt = Price of tender under consideration
- Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

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

3.2.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

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

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

Where

- Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
Pt = Price of tender under consideration
Pmax = Price of highest acceptable tender

4. POINTS AWARDED FOR SPECIFIC GOALS

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

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

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

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

The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	Number of points allocated (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
Youth (100% ownership)	4	
Youth (61 - 99% ownership)	3	
Youth (31 - 60% ownership)	2	
Youth (1 - 30% ownership)	1	
Youth ownership 0%	0	
Women (100% ownership)	4	
Women (61 - 99% ownership)	3	
Women (31 - 60% ownership)	2	
Women (1 - 30% ownership)	1	
Women ownership 0%	0	
Black 100% ownership)	4	
Black (61 - 99% ownership)	3	
Black (31 - 60% ownership)	2	
Black (1 - 30% ownership)	1	
Black ownership 0%	0	
People living with disabilities	4	
Locality		
Based in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro	4	
Based in Eastern Cape		

Based in neighbouring provinces	3	
Based in other provinces	2	
Outside RSA	1	
	0	

DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM

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

4.4. Company registration number:

4.5. TYPE OF COMPANY/ FIRM

- ☐ Partnership/Joint Venture / Consortium
- ☐ One-person business/sole propriety
- ☐ Close corporation
- ☐ Public Company
- ☐ Personal Liability Company
- ☐ (Pty) Limited
- ☐ Non-Profit Company
- ☐ State Owned Company

[TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

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

- i) The information furnished is true and correct;
- ii) The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form;
- iii) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraphs 1.4 and 4.2, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the organ of state that the claims are correct;
- iv) If the specific goals have been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the organ of state may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –
 - (a) disqualify the person from the tendering process;
 - (b) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person's conduct;
 - (c) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered

as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;

- (d) recommend that the tenderer or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, be restricted from obtaining business from any organ of state for a period not exceeding 10 years, after the *audi alteram partem* (hear the other side) rule has been applied; and
- (e) forward the matter for criminal prosecution, if deemed necessary.

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