



TERMS OF REFERENCE

For the Provision of Evaluation Services on Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women Project to the Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC)

Programme Identification

Name of Client	GTAC/Jobs Fund
Project Reference Number	PN558
Name of Project	Impact Evaluation of Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women Project
Contracting Authority	Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC), National Treasury
Accountable Officer	Acting Head of GTAC
Project Purpose	For the Provision of Impact Evaluation Services on Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women Project, to the GTAC/Jobs Fund

Contents

1	REQUEST FOR QUOTATION	3
2	BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	3
2.1	The Jobs Fund.....	3
2.2	Phakamani Foundation.....	4
3	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES.....	5
3.1	General Evaluation Objective	5
3.2	Specific Evaluation Objectives and Questions.....	6
3.2.1	Evaluation Objectives.....	6
3.2.2	Evaluation Questions	7
4	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EVALUATION	8
5	SCOPE OF THE SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED	9
5.1	Desktop Review.....	9
5.2	Primary Data Collection	10
6	EXPECTED OUTPUTS, TIMELINES AND MILESTONES	10
6.1	Timeline and Milestones	10
7	PROPOSAL.....	11
7.1	Proposal Structure	11
8	KEY PERSONNEL	12
8.1	Skills, Experience and Competencies.....	12
9	EVALUATION CRITERIA	12
9.1	Evaluation Phases/Methodology.....	13
9.1.1	Stage 1a: Administrative Compliance	14
9.1.2	Stage 1b: Mandatory Compliance (Disqualification)	15
9.1.3	Phase Two: Desktop Evaluation	15
9.1.4	Phase 2: Stage Two- Interview Evaluation	19
9.1.5	Phase 3: Price and Specific Goals Evaluation	20
10	FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.....	21
11	CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.....	22
12	OTHER BID CONDITIONS.....	22
13	BID VALIDITY PERIOD	22
14	LEGAL IMPLICATIONS.....	22
15	CLARIFICATIONS	22
16	COMMUNICATION.....	22
17	COUNTER CONDITIONS	22
18	PROHIBITION OF RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES	23
19	BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP.....	23
20	SUBMISSION DETAILS	24

1 REQUEST FOR QUOTATION

The Jobs Fund invites suitably qualified and experienced organisations to respond to these Terms of Reference (ToR) for impact evaluation services required on the Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for three Rural Women Projects. A suitably qualified and skilled evaluation team that fulfils the evaluation requirements is sought to conduct an impact evaluation of the projects based on goals and objectives that reinforce the impact of the intervention. The impact evaluation is required to assess the short-, medium-- and long-term impact (intended or unintended) the projects have made beyond their implementation. The main purpose of the impact evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project model has been able and/or continues to make the intended (and unintended) impact, assess what makes the model work and micro and macro factors that impact on the project, and its ability to ensure the sustainability of the results (outputs and outcomes) realised at the project, target beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholder levels.

2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The Jobs Fund

The Employment Facilitation sub-programme was introduced by the National Treasury in 2011 to contribute to employment and inclusive growth by supporting innovative approaches to job creation and enterprise development. The key component of the programme is the Jobs Fund, a multi-year R9 billion investment which leverages complementary funding from public and private sector project partners.

The President announced the Jobs Fund during the State of the Nation Address on 10 February 2011. The objective of the Jobs Fund is to co-finance innovative public and private sector initiatives that will significantly contribute to job creation. The Jobs Fund operates on challenge fund principles, as a catalyst for innovation and investment in new ways of working that directly contribute to long-term sustainable employment creation.

Globally, challenge funds have emerged as an effective and versatile financing mechanism with which to channel public money to catalyse pro-poor innovation and investment in emerging markets and to provide profitable ways of improving market access for the poor. In practice, challenge funds are highly versatile and can be deployed across a variety of contexts and sectors, targeting a range of outcomes from financial education to enterprise-linked poverty reduction and 'pro-poor' growth.

The ultimate development goal of a challenge fund is, through a finite intervention period, to stimulate a long-term change in the way that local supply chains and market systems work to overcome cost, technology, financial, etc. barriers which may have excluded poor producers and households in the past. Systemic change in the way that market systems work is typically the desired outcome of a

challenge fund and is the product of a coincidence of factors (new technology, an environment conducive to investment, and innovative private investors, etc.).

The Jobs Fund assists partners in piloting innovative approaches to sustainable job creation through four funding windows, namely, Enterprise Development, Support for Work-seekers, Infrastructure and Institutional Capacity Building. The Jobs Fund accepts applications from the private, public and non-governmental sectors during calls for proposals and project partners are required to share both risk and costs by matching the grant fund allocation generally on a ratio of 1:1.

In addition to focusing on creating jobs for the unemployed, the Jobs Fund has an explicit learning and knowledge dissemination agenda, which is intended to encourage new thinking and new approaches to job creation. During the implementation process, a significant body of learning has been generated. Project-level evaluation presents an opportunity to initiate the process of documenting and sharing these insights in terms of what models are most successful in job creation and which of these models are replicable and show promise for scalability.

2.2 Phakamani Foundation

The Phakamani Foundation (hereinafter referred to as “the Foundation”) is a Section 21 not-for-profit company (NPO) and Section 18A public benefit organisation that started operations in March 2008 as a development micro-finance institution (DMFI) which provides loans, group network support, training, and guidance for financially excluded micro-entrepreneurs. The Foundation uses international best practices modelled along the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, and a group lending system in which micro-entrepreneurs are given very small loans to facilitate businesses that they choose, with each person guaranteeing the loans of others. The model has been time-tested across the world, including Africa.

The Foundation focuses on a different space – micro-enterprise development in the informal economy of millions of poor South Africans – in which it helps borrowers with strong business ideas with both start-up capital and working capital. Phakamani’s vision is to see a nation in which even the poorest entrepreneur has an opportunity to create a sustainable business. In the organisation’s experience, a micro-enterprise loan, combined with well-structured guidance and training within the form of group support can lead to self-employment, accumulation of skills and confidence, provision of services to local community and generation of immediate family income and savings.

Phakamani recognised that credit targeted to micro-finance, combined with other types of critical support for the entrepreneur, can have a real impact. Against that background, the Foundation provides access to affordable credit and other kinds of critical support to those in need to help them create stable and sustainable micro-enterprises. The Foundation targeted rural and peri-urban areas with very high

unemployment and identified the poorest people within these communities using a household index, an asset test and a basic interview.

Under the programme titled “Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women”, Phakamani Foundation has implemented three successive projects funded by the Jobs Fund:

1. JF3: Implemented over three years between January 2015 and December 2017
2. JF8a: Implemented over three years from 2019 to 2022
3. JF8b Implemented over three years from 2021 to 2024

The project aimed to foster entrepreneurial spirit while directly empowering women to earn an income and improve their living conditions. The programme involves basic financial or business training (cash flow management, how/why to save and invest in their businesses, how to manage stock for greater profit, etc); short-term loans ranging from R700 to R1 700; and a critical group support network. Women entrepreneurs joined in groups of five, each with their own microbusiness. The Foundation assessed each successful loan applicant and then provided training. Typical ventures include spaza shops, re-upholstery, dressmaking, linen manufacturing, cooked food stalls, fresh vegetable stalls, beading and brickmaking.

3 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

3.1 General Evaluation Objective

The broad purpose of this impact evaluation is to assess the extent to which the “Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women” projects (JF3, JF8a and JF8b) have made a positive **impact** (intended or unintended) mainly on the directly targeted beneficiaries, as well as other stakeholders over the period during which the three projects were implemented. The effects of the projects will be assessed by tracking changes over this time. This provides insights into patterns, efficacy, and sustainability approaches and monitors results at various intervals over time. In this case, the impact will be measured at the following three intervals.

1. At up to 2 years of post-implementation (JF8b)
2. At between 2 years and 5 years of post-implementation (JF8a)
3. And at between 5 years and 10 years of post-implementation (JF3)

The evaluation should be done based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee’s (DAC) criteria upon which evaluative judgements are made in determining the merit or worth of a project intervention.

Table 1: DAC Criteria

Criteria	Definition
Relevance	The responsiveness of an intervention to the needs of target beneficiaries, and the ability to continue doing so if circumstances change.
Coherence	The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution
Effectiveness	The attainment of objectives and results, including differential results across groups.
Efficiency	Delivery of results in an economic and timely manner. Value for money is assessed by comparing outputs (qualitative and quantitative) in relation to inputs (resources).
Impact	The significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. It assesses changes (social, economic, development and environmental) produced by the JF-supported projects, directly and indirectly, and intended and unintended.
Sustainability	The extent to which the net benefits of a project intervention are likely to continue.

3.2 Specific Evaluation Objectives and Questions

3.2.1 Evaluation Objectives

The specific **impact evaluation objectives** to be addressed are as follows:

- a. To assess the intervention design (relevance and gender equity).
- b. To assess how well the intervention was implemented and adapted as intended (effectiveness and efficiency).
- c. To assess if the intervention produced the intended impacts in the short-, medium- and long-term (effectiveness, impact and gender equity).
- d. To identify the intended and unintended positive impacts the intervention has produced (effectiveness and impact).
- e. To assess how valuable the intervention's impacts are to the targeted beneficiaries, community and/or other stakeholders involved (relevance and gender equity).
- f. To assess the extent to which the intervention represents the best possible use of the available resources to achieve results of the greatest possible value to participants (project funders, implementing partners, target beneficiaries), community, and other relevant stakeholders (efficiency).
- g. To determine overall recommendations that can be made regarding the potential for continuation or discontinuation, scaling-up and replication of the project model for other different groups of beneficiaries in the same or different settings.
- h. To assess the extent to which the positive impacts realised are likely to be sustained.

3.2.2 Evaluation Questions

Consistent with the impact evaluation objectives specified above, the corresponding **impact evaluation questions** to be addressed are as follows:

- a. How was the intervention design relevant ? (relevance and equity)
- b. How well was the intervention implemented and adapted as needed? (effectiveness and efficiency)
- c. Has the intervention produced the intended impacts in the short-, medium- and long-term? If so, for whom, to what extent and in what circumstances? (effectiveness, impact and gender equity)
- d. What intended and unintended positive impacts has the intervention produced? How did these occur? (effectiveness, impact and equity)
- e. How valuable are the intervention's impacts to the targeted beneficiaries, community and/or other stakeholders involved? (relevance)
- f. To what extent does the intervention represent the best possible use of available resources to achieve results of the greatest possible value to participants (project funders, implementing partners, beneficiaries) and the community? (efficiency)
- g. What overall recommendations can be made regarding the potential for continuation or dissemination, scaling-up and replication of the project model for different groups of beneficiaries in the same or different settings?
- h. What is the extent to which the positive impacts realised to date likely to be sustained?

Below are some of the metrics that can be used in responding to the evaluation questions above for all three projects and comparisons can be made across the three to determine the effects of time on the outcomes:

1. Phakamani financing model, which combines grants with loans from second-tier lenders (SEFA, etc) and then on-lends to the beneficiaries. What has been the effect of the JF grant on this model?
2. Phakamani's performance:
 - a. Repayment rate.
 - b. Client retention rate.
 - c. New client enrolment.
 - d. Average loan size.
 - e. Savings balances.
 - f. Profitability per project i.e. JF3, JF8a and JF8b (timing of the evaluation i.e. over 5 years, over 2 years and up to 2 years respectively).
 - g. Composition of clients (demographics).
3. Profile of beneficiaries.
 - a. *Demographic Analysis*: Collect data on beneficiaries' age, education level, family size, and household income to create a comprehensive profile.

- b. *Economic Activities*: Identify the types of businesses beneficiaries are involved in, including their challenges and successes.
 - c. *Financial Literacy*: Evaluate beneficiaries' financial literacy levels, as this can influence their ability to manage loans effectively.
- 4. Micro, Meso and Macro economic environment affecting the project, including market demand, competition, and supplier availability.
 - a. *Market Demand*: Evaluate the size and demand for products or services offered by beneficiaries, focusing on local market conditions.
 - b. *Competition*: Analyse the competitive landscape to understand how local businesses impact beneficiaries' income-generating activities.
 - c. *Supplier Availability*: Assess the availability and quality of suppliers that beneficiaries rely on for their businesses affecting their operational efficiency.
 - d. *Cost of capital*: Assess the interest rates charged and the quality of ancillary services linked to the loan's provision.
 - e. *Services beyond credit*: Assess the services offered by Phakamani beyond credit e.g. savings, skills training, social capital building, etc.
- 5. Evaluate the impact of microfinance (the project) on the beneficiaries, iro poverty alleviation asset accumulation, food security, financial inclusion and business growth, longevity of running a business, and diversification as variable indicators of their development. Clients who exited the programme either those who have outgrown the need for the MFI ("graduates", who hopefully can access commercial banking services) and those for whom participation did not bring great benefits ("dropouts" — who were either dissatisfied with the program or were unable to pay for the MFI's services).
- 6. Evaluate the sustainability of the project in terms of financial, institutional, and social factors.
 - a. *Financial*: Identify challenges and barriers faced by the beneficiaries in accessing and utilising the loans
 - b. *Institutional*: The evaluation should also identify the challenges facing Phakamani in implementing microfinance and vis a vis the role that the JF played in the process.
 - c. *Social Factors*: The evaluation should indicate whether the program has built social capital has improved peer networks that enhance social cohesion and mutual support, and if loans have contributed to improved living standards, such as better housing, education, or healthcare for beneficiaries.

4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EVALUATION

An impact evaluation provides information about observed changes (positive and/or negative, intended and/or unintended, direct and/or indirect) produced by an intervention by identifying the primary causes of the observed changes through 'causal attribution' or 'causal inference'. If an impact evaluation fails to systematically conduct causal attribution, there is a greater risk that the evaluation may produce

incorrect findings that can lead to incorrect decisions relating to continuation or termination, scaling-up and replication of the project intervention.

Following the end of the Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women project (JF3) in KwaZulu-Natal province in 2017, Phakamani Foundation successfully secured another contracted grant funding from the Jobs Fund; and undertook phase 2 implementation of the project “Phakamani: Creating Micro-Jobs for Rural Women (JF8a and JF8b) in Eastern Cape province. The implementation of this project in another region suggests that the project has been deemed effective in achieving its goals and objectives of creating jobs in the economy.

Against this background, findings from this impact evaluation of the initial project (JF3) will provide critical insights that can be used to improve or reorient the intervention, and to inform decisions about whether to continue, discontinue, replicate or scale-up the intervention. Furthermore, findings can be used to improve the implementation of similar project(s) for the next intake of target beneficiaries by identifying key elements to monitor and manage. The findings will not only provide information about “what works”, but also provide information about what is needed to make the intervention work for different groups in different settings, thus ensuring management decisions regarding the potential for scaling-up and replication of the project.

5 SCOPE OF THE SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED

In conducting an impact evaluation of selected evaluations, the inputs of all critical stakeholders are important. It is thus important that as part of planning an impact evaluation, a sufficient stakeholder list should be drawn and agreed upon with the commissioners of these Terms of Reference (ToR). The ToR require robust evaluation methods and analogous methodologies that are suitable for the scope of the evaluations. *The evaluation questions of this impact evaluation should be answered using a combination of evidence.* The bulk of evidence to be gathered will be from secondary sources (eg. outcome evaluation), and primary sources (e.g. surveys among direct beneficiaries, implementing partners, other relevant stakeholders, etc).

Under the supervision of the commissioners of these ToRs, the preferred service provider will be appointed to conduct the required impact evaluation.

5.1 Desktop Review

This includes the collection, review and consolidation of:

- Relevant legislation, regulations and subject-matter literature,
- Summative outcome evaluation, and
- Jobs Fund evaluation criteria and guidelines.

5.2 Primary Data Collection

It is envisaged that the service provider will undertake the following data collection activities:

- Conduct key informant interviews with, at a minimum:
 - The Fund Project Managers.
 - The Jobs Fund Partner.
 - Relevant internal JF staff who were involved in evaluations of the project; and
 - Target beneficiaries of the project intervention, and other relevant stakeholders.
- Design a qualitative and quantitative data analysis plan.
- It is expected that the service provider is well-versed in conducting primary and secondary research.

6 EXPECTED OUTPUTS, TIMELINES AND MILESTONES

The following outputs are expected under this assignment:

- a. Inception report.
- b. Work plan and design document including evaluation approaches, methods, questions, analysis framework a quality assurance plan; best practice benchmark (internationally).
- c. Draft report.
- d. Presentation of preliminary findings, lessons and good practice guidelines.
- e. Final evaluation report (with Executive Summary) that responds to the agreed learning questions, incorporating feedback obtained from the presentation and draft report review comments.
- f. Appendices with details on the approaches, and
- g. A summary report covering the lessons learnt, good practice and recommendations.

6.1 Timeline and Milestones

The bidder is required to indicate proposed timelines for the milestones (see section 7.1). Presented below are the milestones envisaged for the evaluation. The specific details will need to be confirmed in negotiation with the Jobs Fund to ensure the timely completion of the evaluation and delivery of the evaluation report.

Table 2: Milestones

Activity	Deliverable*
Contract start date	Finalised and signed contract
Evaluation work plan and methodology	Inception report
Documents reviews, data analysis and report writing	Draft evaluation report
Presentation of the draft report	Presentation
Submission of final evaluation report and summary report	Final evaluation report

7 PROPOSAL

National Treasury (GTAC) reserves the right to appoint, and the service provider permits that previous employers and/or institutions may be contacted to obtain references regarding the expertise and general standard work.

Based on the brief outlined in the Terms of Reference, the service provider is requested to propose the approach to the evaluation. The ToR should serve as the basis, although enhancements to the brief will be welcomed as long as they are substantiated.

7.1 Proposal Structure

The proposal should include:

- a. Understanding of the Terms of Reference of the evaluation.
- b. Indication of the timelines for the deliverables as outlined in Table 2.
- c. Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation.
- d. Activity-based plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities).
- e. Comprehensive output-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT, indicating clearly costs of individual outputs).
- f. Key personnel on the evaluation team (team members, roles and level of effort).
- g. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality).

8 KEY PERSONNEL

Proposals should indicate the key personnel who will be directly involved in the work, together with their envisaged role. The relevant expertise of each individual to this assignment should be clearly outlined (full CVs are required).

8.1 Skills, Experience and Competencies

The service provider should have a minimum of three years of experience in conducting impact evaluations related to social protection, public employment, and youth development programs. An outline of the required skills, competencies and track record required for carrying out the scope of work outlined in this evaluation are suggested in the list below:

- a. Knowledge of publicly funded government initiatives, including challenge funds.
- b. Familiarity with the National Evaluation Policy, 2019 and the South African National Evaluation System.
- c. Experience in researching and evaluating public-financed job creation and employment interventions.
- d. Knowledge and strong skills in the application of non-experimental designs.
- e. Social facilitation and stakeholder engagement skills in development projects (particularly in Non-Profit Sector interventions).
- f. Understanding of the economic development dynamics and unemployment in South Africa.
- g. Key personnel are to have a minimum of a 3-year-graduate degree or relevant experience in fields of labour economics, social protection, public employment and youth development, social science, public policy and other relevant or equivalent qualifications.
- h. Proposals should indicate the key personnel who will be directly involved in the work, together with their envisaged role and time allocation. The relevant expertise of each individual to this assignment should be clearly outlined (full CVs are required).

9 EVALUATION CRITERIA

GTAC has set minimum standards that bidders must meet to be selected as the successful bidder.

The successful bidder will be awarded the contract for the **9-month** duration of the service requirements and will be selected based on the following three-phase process:

9.1 Evaluation Phases/Methodology

Table 3: Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Stage	Description
Phase 1	<p>Administrative Compliance</p> <p>A bidder is required to submit the administrative compliance documents as referred to in paragraph 9.1.1.</p> <p>Mandatory Compliance – Disqualification</p> <p>Failure to submit any of the required mandatory documents will lead to disqualification.</p>
Phase 2 – Stage 1	<p>Technical Evaluation: Desktop Evaluation</p> <p>Bidders must submit information as per Bid Submission Requirements. The submitted technical proposal must respond to the Technical Evaluation criteria cited in these Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The Technical proposal will be evaluated out of 100 points with a Threshold of 70 points.</p> <p>Only bidders who meet the threshold will be considered for the Specific Goals evaluation.</p> <p>The Proposals will be assessed based on the Desktop evaluation criteria below and bidders that meet the minimum threshold of 70 points will be evaluated further for interview Stage 2.</p> <p><i>Bidders must note that submission of Annexures A (CV Template), and Annexure B (Price Proposal) in the prescribed formats is recommended.</i></p>
Phase 2 – Stage 2	<p>Interview Evaluation</p> <p>Bidders who meet the minimum threshold in Stage One will be invited to attend an interview, which will include a brief presentation on the background of the bidder, the team and the understanding of the assignment.</p> <p>Only bidders who meet the minimum threshold of 70 points for interviews will be considered for the Price and Specific Goals evaluation.</p>
Phase 3	<p>Price and Specific Goals</p> <p>Preference points in the 80/20 formula will be awarded to bidders for attaining a score for Specific goals as indicated in Table 8. Bidders must provide the required information for evaluation purposes.</p>

It should be noted that the stages are considered to be separate processes and, as a result, the score from phase two - stage one will not be used in phase two - stage two to calculate a total overall score. These three phases are mutually exclusive and will be treated as such in the appraisal.

9.1.1 Stage 1a: Administrative Compliance

During this phase, bid documents will be reviewed to determine compliance with tax matters and the Central Supplier Database (CSD) at the closing date and time of bid.

Bidders must submit all returnable documents as outlined in the table below.

Should a bidder fail to submit or fully complete the indicated SBD forms, the bidder must be requested to provide fully completed form(s) within two days from the date of notification. Failure to adhere to the notification should result in a bid being disqualified immediately after the two days have lapsed.

Table 4: Bid requirements compilation and submission:

Document to be submitted	Requirement
Electronic submission: The bid proposal to be submitted to the relevant platform before closing date and time of the bid. The folders/files must be clearly marked and separated.	Electronic submission: Confirmation report to indicate all bid documents received on or before the closing date and time of the bid.
SBD 1- Invitation to Bid	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document.
Central Supplier Database (CSD) Registration Report or CSD registration number or SARS pin	Bidders must be registered on the Central Database System (CSD) at the closing date and time of the bid.
SBD 3.3 – Pricing Schedule	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document.
Note: A bidder who fails to complete or does not submit the SBD 3 form will be disqualified without being granted an opportunity to submit a price.	
SBD 4 - Bidder's Disclosure (Refer to note below)	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Note: Bidders must submit the attached SBD 4 document. A bid may be disqualified if this disclosure is found not to be true and complete in every respect. The following definitions should be considered when completing the form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Person" means a bidder or supplier or shareholder, director, trustee, partner, or member of a bidder or supplier having the controlling interest in the bidder or supplier. - "State" means a national or provincial department, a national or provincial public entity or constitutional institution, a municipality or municipal entity, a provincial legislature or parliament 	

Document to be submitted	Requirement
SBD 6.1 - Preferential Point Claim form in terms of the Preferential Procurement Regulation (PPR) 2022	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document. Failure to submit or fully complete SBD 6.1 will result in the bidder forfeiting points for specific goals.
Prescribed CV templates	Complete and sign the supplied pro forma template.

Tax Clearance Status

A valid tax pin / Central Supplier Database (CSD) number must be provided for purposes of verifying that the tax matters of the bidder are in order. Where consortium/joint ventures/sub-contractor is involved each party to the association must submit a separate validation of Tax status and CSD registration number.

Bidder's tax matters must be compliant at the time of award. In the case where a bidder's tax matters are non-compliant, a bidder will be given a maximum of seven (7) working days to remedy the tax matters. Failure to remedy this will invalidate the bid.

9.1.2 Stage 1b: Mandatory Compliance (Disqualification)

Bidders must submit a responsive proposal in accordance with these terms of reference. Failure to adhere to any of these requirements will result in disqualification:

- Bidders must be registered on the Central Supplier Database (CSD) on the closing date of the Request for Bid (RFB).
- Submission of a technical proposal is required.
- Submission of a price/financial proposal is required as per SBD 3.3.
- Any bidder representative (Director/Shareholder/Proposed Resource) who is employed by the state will not be considered. i.e., in the event that a bidder representative is in the employ of the state, such a bid proposal will not be considered.

9.1.3 Phase Two: Desktop Evaluation

In addition to the proposal, the bidder is expected to submit the following:

Table 5: Submission Requirements

No.	SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (non-submission will lead to disqualification)
1.	Resource Matrix, clearly showing the role, and qualification of each team member for the completion of the project (this must be in the Resource Matrix template provided).

No.	SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (non-submission will lead to disqualification)
2.	Team Experience Matrix, clearly showing the experience of proposed team members as per the stipulated requirements (this must be in the Team Experience template provided)
3.	Project schedule/timeline (this must be in the Project Timeline template)

The Desktop Evaluation criteria are discussed in Table 6 below:

Table 6: Evaluation Criteria

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING	WEIGHT
1.	<p>Demonstrated experience of the service provider to provide evaluation services in the development field</p> <p><i>This will be evaluated at the bidder firm level and information to be provided in Annexure A</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9+ years = 5 7 to 8 years = 4 5 to 6 years = 3 3 to 4 years = 2 < 3 years = 1 No required/relevant experience demonstrated = 0 	20
2.	<p>Project lead experience and expertise in carrying out evaluations, particularly in the development sphere.</p> <p><i>The project lead to be identified, and information on relevant experience to be provided in the resource matrix.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9+ years = 5 7 to 8 years = 4 5 to 6 years = 3 3 to 4 years = 2 < 3 years = 1 No required/relevant experience demonstrated = 0 	15
3.	<p>Project team experience in public-financed youth employment interventions; evaluation, research, and data analytics.</p> <p>The service provider to indicate a team lead and team members, and each of them will be evaluated as per the below. These team members must be marked in the proposal.</p> <p>List projects undertaken which are cross-referenced in the proposal, team experience matrix, and CVs of individual members. Minimum of 3 references.</p>		

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING	WEIGHT
a.	Experience working in public employment types of programmes and models.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9+ years = 5 • 7 to 8 years = 4 • 5 to 6 years = 3 • More than 3 to 4 years = 2 • Below 3 years = 1 • No required/relevant experience demonstrated = 0 	15
b.	Experience of enterprise development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9+ years = 5 • 7 to 8 years = 4 • 5 to 6 years = 3 • More than 3 to 4 years = 2 • Below 3 years = 1 • No required/relevant experience demonstrated = 0 	15
c.	Experience conducting evaluations using a variety of methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9+ years = 5 • 7 to 8 years = 4 • 5 to 6 years = 3 • More than 3 to 4 years = 2 • below 3 years = 1 • No required/relevant experience demonstrated = 0 	10
4.	Approach: Relevance, quality and creativity of the technical approach to the research study.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = Excellent (Analyses/ Studies/ Dissemination directly responds to the ToR, is plausible [considering the timeline and expertise], offers novel and practical ideas, and is likely to significantly exceed expectations) • 4 = Good (Analyses/Studies/ Dissemination responds to the ToR, is plausible [considering the timeline and proposed expertise], and is likely to exceed expectations) 	25

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	SCORING	WEIGHT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 = Average (Analyses/Studies/Dissemination responds to the ToR; is plausible [considering the timeline and proposed expertise], and will meet expectations) • 2 = Below Average (Analyses/Studies/Dissemination only responds in part to the ToR, is implausible [considering the timeline and proposed expertise], and is unlikely to meet expectations) • 1 = Poor (Analyses/Studies/Dissemination does not respond to the ToR; is implausible [considering the timeline and proposed expertise], and will not meet expectations) • 0 = Non-submission/demonstration of the submission of Relevance, quality and creativity technical approach to the research study. 	
Total score			100
Total Technical Minimum Threshold to proceed to the interview stage NB: Only bidders who meet the minimum threshold for desktop interviews will be considered for further evaluation.			70

Failure to meet a minimum threshold of 70 points for desktop evaluation will result in the disqualification of the bidder.

The service providers that achieve the minimum threshold in Stage One: desktop evaluation will be called for an interview.

9.1.3.1. Other Technical Evaluation Requirements

Bidders should ensure that the following submission requirements are included in their bids. Non-submission may result in a score of zero (0).

- a) Service providers must submit all the information required for evaluation purposes including the CV of the proposed expert.
- b) Bidders must ensure that the CV is signed by the respective individuals confirming that he/she is not included in bids from other service providers. GTAC reserves the right to confirm with individuals where their names appear in more than one bid.

Failure by a bidder to comply with the above minimum requirements may result in such Bidder's proposal not being evaluated further or affect the technical evaluation score that is awarded.

9.1.4 Phase 2: Stage Two- Interview Evaluation

Those bidders who meet the minimum threshold in Stage One will attend an interview, which will include delivering a presentation to the evaluation panel. This process will be used to verify the following:

Table 7: Interview Evaluation Criteria

NO	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GUIDELINES FOR CRITERIA APPLICATION	WEIGHT
	Demonstration of knowledge and skills	5 = Excellent (Demonstrated capability is significantly above the expected capability level) 4 = Good (Demonstrated capability exceeds the expected capability level) 3 = Average (Demonstrated capability meets the expected capability level) 2 = Below Average (Demonstrated capability is below the expected capability level) 1 = Poor (Demonstrated capability is significantly below the expected capability level)	40
	Demonstration of the understanding of the ToR and responsiveness of the proposal to the ToR	5 = Excellent (Demonstrated capability is significantly above the expected capability level) 4 = Good (Demonstrated capability exceeds the expected capability level) 3 = Average (Demonstrated capability meets the expected capability level) 2 = Below Average (Demonstrated capability is below the expected capability level)	60

NO	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GUIDELINES FOR CRITERIA APPLICATION	WEIGHT
		1 = Poor (Demonstrated capability is significantly below the expected capability level)	
Total score			100
Minimum threshold			70

Only bidders that meet the 70 points threshold will be considered for Price and Specific Goals evaluation in terms of Preferential Procurement Regulation (PPR) 2022.

9.1.5 Phase 3: Price and Specific Goals Evaluation

- a. Preferential Procurement Evaluation will be based on the 80/20 principle.
- b. The applicable formula (80/20) will be utilised to evaluate the bid, of which eighty (80) points are allocated for the price as allocated in the enclosed form SBD 6.1. that must be completed, and the remaining twenty (20) points are allocated for the specific goals as indicated in Table 8 below.
- c. Submission of a price proposal is required in the proforma format. (SBD 3.3). Bidders need to provide cost per output, inclusive of VAT.
- d. GTAC reserves the right to negotiate the price offer or rates with the recommended bidder(s).

Table 8: Price and Specific Goals Evaluation Criteria

Number of points allocated (80/20 system)	
Price	80
The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	20
Above 30% ownership for Historically Disadvantaged Individuals who had no franchise in national elections before the 1983 and 1993 Constitutions.	10

Women percentage of ownership: 30% and above	10
Total Points	100

The CSD report shall be used as evidence to confirm/award points for specific goals. It is the responsibility of the bidding entity to ensure that the information on the CSD is updated.

Table 9: Definitions

<u>Terminology</u>	<u>Definition</u>
“Specific Goals”	means specific goals as contemplated in section 2(1)(d) of the Act which may include contracting with persons, or categories of persons, historically disadvantaged by unfair discrimination on the basis of race, gender and disability including the implementation of programmes of the Reconstruction and Development Programme as published in <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 16085 dated 23 November 1994;
Historically Disadvantaged Individual (HDI)	<p>means a South African citizen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. who, due to the apartheid policy that had been in place, had no franchise in national elections prior to the introduction of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1983 (Act No 110 of 1983) or the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1993, (Act No 200 of 1993) (“the interim Constitution); and/or 2. who is a female; and/or 3. who has a disability. <p>provided that a person who obtained South African citizenship on or after the coming to effect of the Interim Constitution, is deemed not to be an HDI;</p>

10 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The service provider will be required to attend meetings virtually, when deemed necessary by the Jobs Fund. The quotation should be inclusive of all travel-related costs to the sites.

All quotations would need to specify the deliverables to be completed, time allocated to each deliverable and cost implications (please include price proposal as per SBD 3.3).

11 CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

The Contracting Authority will be the Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC).

12 OTHER BID CONDITIONS

- a. Prior to the appointment, the recommended service provider may be required to submit additional supporting documentation.
- b. GTAC reserves the right to negotiate the final offer with the recommended bidder before the award.

13 BID VALIDITY PERIOD

The bid will be valid 90 (ninety) days from the closing date of the bid.

14 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The successful service provider must be prepared to enter into a service-level agreement with GTAC.

15 CLARIFICATIONS

- a) Requests for clarification must be made in writing by e-mail to psp@gtac.gov.za.
- b) Requests for clarification will be accepted by GTAC as specified in the bid document. The submission reference must be included in the subject line of the email.
- c) Telephonic enquiries for clarification will not be accepted. Bidders must reduce all enquiries to writing.

16 COMMUNICATION

Professional Services Procurement (PSP) within GTAC will communicate with bidders where bid clarity is sought, or to obtain information or to extend the validity period.

Any communication by the bidder (either by facsimile, letter, electronic mail or any other form of correspondence) to any government official, or representative, or a person acting in an advisory capacity for the National Treasury in respect of this bid between the closing date and the award of the bid is prohibited.

17 COUNTER CONDITIONS

Bidders' attention is drawn to the fact that amendments to any of the Information to bid by bidders will result in invalidation of such bids.

18 PROHIBITION OF RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES

In terms of section 4(1) of the Competition Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended, an agreement between, or concerted practice by, firms, or a decision by an association of firms, is prohibited if it is between parties in a horizontal relationship and if a bidder(s) is/are or a contractor(s) was/were involved in:

- a. Directly or indirectly fixing a purchase or selling price or any other trading condition.
- b. Dividing markets by allocating customers, suppliers, territories or specific types of goods or services; or
- c. Collusive bidding.
- d. If a bidder(s) or contractor(s), in the judgment of the purchaser, has/have engaged in any of the restrictive practices referred to above, the purchaser may, without prejudice to any other remedy provided for, invalidate the bid(s) for such item(s) offered or terminate the contract in whole or in part and refer the matter to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties as contemplated in the Competition Act No. 89 of 1998.

19 BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP

The bidder/s are required to provide the below information for transparency.

- a. A beneficial owner of a company is an individual who, directly or indirectly, ultimately owns that company or exercises effective control over that company.
- b. Companies are required to keep a register of their beneficial owners and to provide this information to the Companies and Intellectual Property Commission (CIPC). The CIPC maintains a central register of beneficial ownership information.
- c. The beneficial ownership regime in South Africa is intended to improve transparency and accountability in the corporate sector. It is also intended to help to prevent money laundering and terrorist financing.
- d. Companies are required to keep a register of their beneficial owners and must disclose in their bids the following information as provided for in their register for information of each beneficial owner:
 - Name
 - Date of birth
 - Identity number or passport number
 - Residential address
 - Occupation
 - Nature and extent of control over the company

20 SUBMISSION DETAILS

Bidders to note that only electronic submission is allowed for this bid using the GTAC Vendor Portal, available on the link provided below:

<https://vendorportal.gtac.gov.za/>

Bidders are required to first register on the GTAC Vendor Portal and then login to the portal to access the tender.

The registration process involves the following steps:

- a) Register as a portal user. This is the process of creating a user account on the vendor portal. This will allow the user to view and respond to tenders.
- b) Register your supplier details. Registering your company details will allow you as the supplier to upload relevant information and documents. Supplier details must be captured in order to receive a vendor or supplier number, and will then be eligible to respond to tenders.

To respond to this tender, suppliers should login to the portal and navigate to the tender menu then select "Formal" then click on "Current". This will provide a list of the available tenders.

Bidders can select this tender (reference TEN0000031) to start the submission process.

The capturing process is in the form of a wizard with the system guiding you through each step. Once all the required information is completed, remember to submit your bid. Only submitted bids will be eligible for award.

NB: Do not submit hardcopy bids to GTAC or the Tender Information Centre (TIC) Submissions received after the closing date and time will not be accepted.