



**small business
development**

Department:
Small Business Development
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

**THE DEPARTMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (DSBD) INVITES
EXPERIENCED SERVICE PROVIDERS TO CONDUCT IMPACT EVALUATION OF THE
INCUBATION SUPPORT PROGRAMME (ISP)**

DSBD 0002 ISP/2022

Date issued : 29th July 2022

Online briefing session : 12th August 2022

Time : 10:00 am – 12:00pm.

Details : Teams Meeting platform

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or join by entering a meeting ID

Meeting ID: 351 256 617 119

Passcode: Yx7WiH

Closing date and time : 29th August 2022 at 11:00

Bid Validity Period : 120 days

TENDER BOX ADDRESS:

Supply Chain Management

77 MEINTJIES STREET

3rd FLOOR, BLOCK G

the dti CAMPUS

SUNNYSIDE, 0001

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

1. PURPOSE:

To appoint a Professional Service Provider to assess the impact of the Incubation Support Programme from inception (2008) to 2021/22 and to determine how the beneficial impacts can be strengthened

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RATIONALE

The Department of Small Business Development (DSBD) following its establishment in 2014, prioritised and supported the continuation of the Incubation Support Program under the auspices of the Small Enterprise Development Agency (Seda). Seda was established in December 2004, through the National Small Business Amendment Act, NO 29 of 2004) as the agency under then Department of Trade and Industry (the **dti**) and following the promulgation of DSBD in 2014, Seda was transferred to DSBD with its existing programs. Within the broader small enterprise support program, Seda Technology Program has specifically been created to provide both financial and non- financial technology and quality support services for small enterprises.

The main instrument through which STP delivers its services is through the various Technology Business Incubators (TBIs) supported by the program¹. After the Department of Trade and Industry (**the dti**) amended the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) codes in 2013, it served as an important tool to propel and position Co-operatives as suppliers in the core supply chains of Government entities, corporate firms, and the local operations of multinational firms, particularly for Exempted Micro Enterprises (EMEs) with turnover between R0-R10 million and Qualifying Small Enterprises (QSEs) with turnover between R0-R10 million². This provided opportunity for Seda to leverage additional program funding through partnering with Public and Private Sector entities that want to comply with the BBBEE codes but have no internal capacity to design and implement ESD programs or projects. Thus, the introduction and implementation of ISP serves as a provider of support and strategic lever in pursuit of other government broad mandate.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June, 2015

² STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda

Final Version July 2022

Government has spent considerable amount money towards the Incubation Support Program over the years and just an illustration between the period 2014/15 to 2019/20 financial years a cumulative amount of R222,921,775. was spent on the Incubation program³. Furthermore, by 2021, the department will have established a total of 270 incubators and digital hubs, which will be the department's direct contribution to the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF). Given the NDP estimated target of 90% of the 11 million jobs to be created by small businesses and cooperatives, it is important for DSBD to evaluate impact of the Incubation Support Program between the period 2014/15 and 2019/20 and measure the extent to which the anticipated outcomes and impact have been achieved, and to inform how best the program can be strengthened and adequately resourced (decision- making). It should be noted that in between the various implementation period some form of assessment and review of the Incubation Support Program was undertaken, and thus the purpose of this impact evaluation is to assess whether the Incubation Support Program is leading to sustained impacts and longer benefits for targets audience. Key feature of this impact evaluation in the main is to measure if the changes that have occurred or occurring can be attributable to this intervention (Incubation Support Program) and whether the results are sustainable.

The Incubation Support Program (ISP) is a sub-program of the Seda Technology Program (STP). The STP is divided into three elements or sub-programs: Incubation, Technology Transfer, and Quality & Standards. The focus of this evaluation is on incubation, *specifically Centers for Entrepreneurship, Sector-Specific Incubators, and Digital Hubs*. The Entrepreneurship Centers and Sector Specific Incubators have been operational for over five years, while the digital hubs are relatively new.

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of the Incubation Support Programme from inception **(2008) to 2021/22** and to determine how the beneficial impacts can be strengthened.

4. FOCUS OF ENQUIRY THE DEPARMENT WISH TO COVER IN THE IMPACT ASSESMENT

The department has been asked to answer the following questions/ issues about the ISP. These issues will need to be covered in the evaluation framework:

- 4.1.** Did ISP produce the intended impacts in the short, medium, and long term and was the impact attributable to the intervention?
- 4.2.** What is the nature of the impacts and their distribution according to sector, gender, age, and people living with disabilities?
- 4.3.** What other factors have influenced the ISP to achieve impact?
- 4.4.** What enabled or hindered the intervention to achieve these impacts?
- 4.5.** How did ISP contribute to the intended impacts?

³ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

- 4.6.** Does South Africa realize a significant return on investment from ISP against the cost of delivering the programme in terms of:
- Empowerment
 - Skills improvement
 - Job creation and sustained
 - SMME establishment and support
 - Revenue (increased)
- 4.7.** What has been the performance of the ISP program during the period under review including the Digital hubs which were recently introduced later in 2020/21.
- 4.8.** To what extent has the implementation of the ISP been effective (what results have been achieved)? And was the programme implemented as planned?
- 4.9.** How do institutional mechanisms (structure, management, administration, and processes) affect and or enabled the efficiency and effectiveness of a programme?
- 4.10.** Is the current model of delivering ISP cost effective in comparison to alternative models?
- 4.11.** How does ISP performance compare to similar programmes nationally and internationally?

5. INTENDED USERS AND STAKEHOLDERS OF THE EVALUATION

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

Table 1: Incubation Support Program

Institution/s	Purpose and use
1. DSBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve decision-making • To mobilise financial support • To strengthen oversight for the implementing agency • To report on the relevant outcomes and progress towards attainment of the MTSF and NDP • Improve coordination between various key stakeholders • Encourage good practice and mobilise partnerships • Sector alignment • Improved delivery
2. Agencies (Seda)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote accountability • To improve decision- making • To popularise Seda Incubation model as

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

Institution/s	Purpose and use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> best practice across spheres of government To assist in effective implementation of incubators and for learning purposes Information use Improved delivery
3. Parliament/ Portfolio committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For improved oversight For information purposes
4. Academia /private sector role players working with SMMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For increase in body of knowledge For scholarly reference purposes Improved sector practice and support
5. Incubators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To promote accountability To popularise Seda Incubation model as best practice across spheres of government To assist in effective and efficient implementation of incubators and for learning purposes and support to SMMEs Information use
6. SMME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved sector practice and support Improved SMMEs
7. Other gov departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of support for SMMEs Improved policy and decision making Improved delivery

6. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

- 6.1.** The period under review is from **inception (2008) to 2021/22**.
- 6.2.** The prospective service provider should provide an understanding of how programme impacts are differentiated across all the sectors in which the programme components are implemented.
- 6.3. Geographical coverage:** The coverage of the evaluation will be ***national*** (in accordance with Seda Incubation footprint) and will include an analysis of key documents and a nationally representative sample of the Incubators and SMMEs that are being supported or under incubation (in scope), ***disaggregated by province and sectors, gender*** (women, youth and people living with disabilities). To this end, a total of 110 incubators (inclusive of digital hubs) and 3500 SMMEs (supported) are to be scoped in which a representative sample will be selected.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

6.4. Components of the evaluation

The table below indicates specific components that are in-scope and out of scope:

Table 2: Outline in-scope and out of scope components

In Scope	Out of Scope
1. Seda Technology Programme (STP) 1.1. Incubator Support Program 1.1.1. Centres for entrepreneurship (CfE Programme) 1.1.2. Sector Specific Incubators 1.1.3. Digital Hubs (relatively new)	1. Technology Transfer Programme 2. Quality and standards

The evaluation will focus on the Incubation Support program of STP. The program applies and utilises various models of incubation and occurs in phases and/or stages namely, pre-incubation, incubation and post-incubation. Different levels and kind of support are provided to SMMEs at each of the stages. ISP has three components/ types namely, Digital hubs (very new), Centres for entrepreneurship and Sector specific Incubators. This evaluation will focus mainly on the Centres for Entrepreneurship and Sector Specific Incubators and Digital Hubs covering the three phases of implementation and that is pre-incubation, incubation, and post-Incubation.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

7. METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION APPROACH

7.1. Evaluation Design and Framework

In response to the evaluation questions, the prospective service provider should provide the most effective methodology for evaluating the impact of ISP and give credible evidence. The evaluation methodology to be proposed must in accordance with the Guideline on Impact Evaluation issued by the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). Furthermore, a base case or counterfactual must be developed for the impact evaluation informed by the document and literature review and the overall evaluation framework. A quasi-experimental or non-experimental design can be utilised for the study but need to be justified appropriately. That said, the service provider is expected to propose relevant methods to respond to the key evaluation questions stated in the “FOCUS OF ENQUIRY THE DEPARTMENT WISH TO COVER IN THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT “ section above.

Furthermore, it is vital that the study provide a strong case for separating ISP's contribution to the indicated positive outcomes from those of other sources. Thus, the participatory approach with all key stakeholders, identification strategy should be applied and selection of counterfactual as this is an impact evaluation study. The methodology will include visits to SMMEs and various Incubators in the provinces according to the specifications indicated below.

The benchmarking effort should allow for a like-for-like comparison of alternative incubation incentives offered by similar national and international programmes. The benchmarking exercise is expected to be based on a review of secondary data between South African and three other countries to be proposed by the service provider (one from a developed and two from comparator countries, one of which must be an African country) and motivate for the selection. The prospective service provider should propose the most appropriate *cost effectiveness analysis methodology* for responding to the relevant evaluation questions. The methodology needs to compare cost effectiveness of the current ISP implementation model against existing or proposed alternatives. The cost effectiveness analyses will be expected to provide quantitative findings rather than qualitative assessments.

- Review the theory of change and intervention logic of the ISP,
- *If there is a need for design, recommend how the programme could be redesigned.*
- Theory of change must be informed by the relevant contextual factors and programme objectives and intentions

Evaluation questions covering, apart from standard impact evaluation questions:

- Descriptive questions - the way things are/were
- Causal questions - how the programme has caused these things to change

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

- Evaluative question – merit / worth that the change has brought about

7.2. Literature and document review

The document and literature review will include the following:

- Review of all existing information and documents on STP and ISP within SA.
- Relevant international literature that will assist to inform the evaluation design, analysis and recommendations and provide relevant context on ISP and SMME support.
- Contextual information positioning the STP and ISP programmes in relation to other SMME support interventions by other government departments and/or private sector role players.
- Review relevant legislation, policies, programme records, annual reports and strategic documents addressing government economic objectives for the period under review.
- Comparative secondary and tertiary data and information on trends and relevant contextual matters affecting SMME growth and development in SA.

This exercise should further inform the development of the ISP Theory of Change of the Program; and produce an analytical framework to inform the evaluation (some of the previous studies and reviews will be made available).

7.3. Data collection & analysis

- 7.3.1. Different data collection methods can be utilised to allow for mixed methods and comparisons to be done. Sample methods and approaches to be used should be justified and provide for a representative sample and use of standard sampling methods linked to the evaluation framework logic and design.
- 7.3.2. Data and information should be able to be represented nationally, provincially, district and SMME level.
- 7.3.3. Data limitations need to be addressed through the use of the mixed methods as far as possible or stated and captured as part of the overall design of the evaluation. Any assumptions and trade-off need to be stated and agreed.
- 7.3.4. *Case studies* of the different types of incubators, notably the new digital hubs, should be included specifically. A minimum of three (3) case studies should be included. This should include technology based, older digital hubs, best performing digital hubs both in Private and Public Sector. Primary data is to be collection via the mixed methodologies. Secondary and tertiary data is provided for in the document and literature review and not as part of the main data collection process as far as possible.
- 7.3.5. Cross-cutting issues such as should also be captured and measured as part of the evaluation process. These include *gender issues, women, youth and people with*

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022

disabilities. Data and information should be able to be disaggregated to show these issues and any trends.

7.4. Reporting & Recommendations

Following the data collection and analysis stage, a draft report and related presentations will be required before a final report is developed for the evaluation.

7.4.1. The draft report should provide the following:

- Provide the status summary for the period of the Incubator support programme
- Answer key evaluation questions in terms of the evaluation criteria and evaluation design
- Proposed lessons, case studies, best practices, and recommendations

7.4.2. Presentations of the **draft report** will be required as follows:

- This should be workshopped with the steering committee and key stakeholders
- DSBD decision-making structures include agencies.

7.4.3. The **final report** should incorporate all inputs and proposals from the various presentation session of the draft report. The final report should:

- Recommend how the programme should be revised /strengthened; and
- A proposed high-level action plan that can be implemented by DSBD and Seda

7.4.4. Recommend how the system should be revised /strengthened. Recommendations should be specific and practical.

8. EVALUATION PLAN

8.1. Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The following deliverables will be expected:

- Inception Report* by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for initial agreements and expectations in the evaluation.
- Literature review and document analysis Report*
- Evaluation framework including Report structure, evaluation matrix, analytical framework, final data collection instruments and other tools.
- One day workshop to discuss the report structure, evaluation matrix, analytical framework, final data collection instruments and other tools.
- A workshop with stakeholders to discuss and construct theory of change for the programme; *(a validation workshop may also be necessary)*.
- Field work / data collection progress reports

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda

Final Version July 2022

- vii. Draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/5/25 format (note: there may be 2 versions after comments). This includes proposed changes to the delivery of government business.
- viii. A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report; (*note: this workshop may be held to discuss initial findings and recommendations before the draft report*).
- ix. The final evaluation report packaged into two sections as follows impact **evaluation report and case studies report on Digital hubs** with recommendations, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic.
- x. A closed-out workshop to receive the final report
- xi. Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected.
- xii. A PowerPoint or audio-visual presentation of the results and other presentations as required.

8.2. Milestones

The evaluation should be undertaken between September 2022 and to end of February 2023 (6 months). The table below depicts the high-level project plan and payment schedule. These are tentative dates and subject to change.

Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule

Item	Deliverable	Expected milestones	% Payment
1.	Inception Meeting	1 st September 2022	
2.	Submission of Revised Inception Report	15 th September 2022	
3.	Approved Inception Report	25 th September 2022	10%
4.	Sign SLA	2nd week of October 2022	
5.	Literature Review and document analysis Report	3 rd week of October 2022	10%
	Evaluation Implementation		
6.	Submission of draft data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools to test out how the theories of change are working	October-December 2022	
7.	One day workshop to discuss and develop the overarching Theory of Change for the suite of incentives, draft data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools to test out how the theory of change is working		

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

Item	Deliverable	Expected milestones	% Payment
8.	Approval of final data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools		10%
9.	Fieldwork data collection progress reports		
10.	Draft evaluation reports for review. This includes proposed changes to the intervention design.		20%
11.	Workshop with relevant stakeholders to discuss the draft report		
12.	Revised Draft evaluation reports full and 1/5/25 summaries		
13.	Peer Review of the Reports & comments from Steering Committee		
14.	Final Evaluation Reports, Version 1		15%
15.	Comments to service provider from Steering Committee and Peer reviewer on Final Report		
16.	Final reports draft 2 submitted		5%
17.	Case study report		
18.	Approval of the Report by the Steering Committee	December 2022	20%
19.	Close-out Report: Power-point Presentation of the Report at MANCO AND EXCO CEOs' Governance Forum, metadata and survey documentation.	During the month of January 2023	10%

8.3. Budget and payment schedule

The evaluation is donor funded. The payment will be made as per payment schedule above.

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

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

9. EVALUATION TEAM

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. The team must include evaluation specialist with proven experience and relevant qualification, at least a master's degree.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022

Table 4: Team roles and responsibilities

Role(s)	Requirements	Responsibilities
Project manager	Must have seven years and independently managed three evaluation or/and research projects, and formal qualification in project management.	Responsible for overall project management and quality control as well as liaison with client;
Program Evaluation specialist	Must have five years' experience in evaluation and independently led four national evaluations in which one is impact evaluation. He/she must also have a relevant post-graduate qualification, preferably master's degree or/and a relevant Post graduate qualification	Bring specialist knowledge in impact evaluation methodology.
SMME and Enterprise Development Sector specialist	Must have ten years' experience in Enterprise development and must have designed or implemented three SMMEs interventions , a relevant Postgraduate in Entrepreneurship development and or Development studies majoring in economics	Bring in-depth knowledge and understanding of the small business economic sector in particular with regard to Incubation Programmes and be able to bring this insight to ensure that the richness of the programme is explored, and meaningful recommendations derived. Understand the relevant sector/intervention and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments

10. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

10.1. Role of steering committee

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

10.2. Peer Reviewers

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

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

10.3. Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report on evaluation process and commissioning, is Ms Patricia Langa, Director: M&E, DSBD, but in terms of content issues the contact person will be Ms Kefuoe Mohapelo, Director, Oversight ISP, DSBD.

11. STRUCTURE AND CONTENTS OF PROPOSAL TO BE SUBMITTED

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

Box 1. Structure of a proposal

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

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

Attachments

MUST: Examples of reports of 1 impact evaluation undertaken taken in accordance with the national evaluation systems

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

CVs of key personnel

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

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

11.1. Information for service providers

Tenders must be submitted on with electronic and 6 hard copies.

12. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

12.1. Phase 1: Administrative compliance

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

12.2. Phase 2: Functional evaluation

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

Measurement Matrix for Proposal

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

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS), Seda

Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
1.	Term of Reference (ToR)	<p>Addressing the TORs and clearly stipulating the approach, design, and methodology for the evaluation and clearly justify the rationale behind the study design, methodology and related approaches.</p> <p>Clearly articulated the project requirements and scope of work in whereby the methodology, design and approach provided is comprehensive and logical and activities, milestones and timeframes are well presented. Justification for study design. The methodology is responsive to the terms of reference and the scope of work.</p> <p>0 –Unacceptable (The proposal does not address the ToR requirements at all)</p> <p>1 –Poor (The proposal poorly addressed the ToR requirements and stipulated one of the key elements)</p> <p>2- Average (The proposal addressed some of the ToR requirements and stipulated two of the key elements)</p> <p>3- Good (The proposal addressed all the ToR requirements. (The approach, design, methodology for the evaluation is all included. Clear justification of the rationale behind the study design, methodology and related approaches).</p>		30

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
		<p>4- Very good (In addition to 3, short comings / limitation associated with the overall approach to be followed in the study identified and the mitigation strategies articulated)</p> <p>5- Excellent (In addition to 4, there is demonstration of innovative and originality of methodology and approach to addressing the overall study requirements which are likely to increase the use)</p>		
2.	Evaluation leadership	Managing the project and team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in relation to the following three key role players		
2.1.	Project Manager CV indicating qualification/s, experience with two verifiable references of similar completed projects.	Project manager has experience of managing evaluations (Including impact) or research project/s. (Examples and references to be provided). ⁴ 0–Unacceptable (Less than seven year and never independently managed any evaluation or research project and less than seven years) 1–Poor (Less than seven years’ experience and independently managed one evaluation or research project) 2– Average (seven years’ experience and independently managed two evaluations or research projects) 3- Good (Seven years’ experience and independently managed three evaluations or research project/s, and formal qualification in project management.)		10

⁴ Evidence of the project managed must be submitted including the references

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
		<p>4-Very Good (Seven to ten years' experience and independently managed five evaluations or/and research projects, and formal qualification in project management.)</p> <p>5-Excellent (eleven and plus years' experience and independently managed seven evaluations or/and research projects, and formal qualification in project management).</p>		
2.2.	<p>Evaluation Specialist</p> <p>CV indicating qualification/s, experience with two verifiable references of similar completed projects.</p>	<p>Evaluation specialist has experience of undertaking evaluations including impact evaluation (examples and references to be provided)⁵</p> <p>0–Unacceptable (no experience and never independently led national evaluation and or research project)</p> <p>1-Poor (three years' experience in evaluation and independently led one national evaluation)</p> <p>2-Average (Five years' experience in evaluation and independently led two national evaluations but not impact evaluation)</p> <p>3-Good (five years' experience in evaluation and independently led four national evaluations in which one is impact evaluation and relevant post-graduate qualifications)</p> <p>4-Very Good (Six to ten years' experience in evaluation and independently led six national evaluations in which two are</p>		15

⁵ Evidence of the evaluation led and undertaken must be submitted including the references.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
		<p>impact evaluations and relevant post-graduate qualifications)</p> <p>5. Excellent (eleven and plus experience years in evaluation, independently led eight national evaluations in which three are impact evaluations and relevant master's qualifications)</p>		
2.3.	<p>Sector Specialist: Enterprise Development</p> <p>CV indicating qualification/s, experience with two verifiable references of similar completed projects.</p>	<p>Sector specialist has experience in enterprise development and intervention design or implementation.</p> <p>0–Unacceptable (no experience and relevant qualifications and no intervention designed/ implemented)</p> <p>1–Poor (less than five years' experience in Enterprise Development and with one SMMEs intervention designed/implemented)</p> <p>2- Average (six to nine years' experience in Enterprise Development, relevant experience and two SMMEs intervention designed or implemented)</p> <p>3–Good (Ten years' experience in Enterprise Development, three interventions designed / implemented and relevant Postgraduate in Entrepreneurship development and or Development studies majoring in economics</p> <p>4–Very Good (eleven to fifteen years' experience in Enterprise development, four interventions designed / implemented and relevant Postgraduate in Entrepreneurship development and or Development studies majoring in economics</p>		10

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
		5- Excellent (sixteen plus years' experience in Enterprise development, five interventions designed / implemented and relevant Postgraduate in Entrepreneurship development and or Development studies majoring in economics.		
3.	Implementation of evaluation			
3.1.	Project Plan	<p>Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)</p> <p>0– Unacceptable (No Plan) 1 – Poor (Project plan did not include milestones) 2 – Average (Project plan with clear milestones presented) 3 – Good (Project plan, with clear and realistic milestones meeting timeframes described and an indication of resource allocation) 4 – Very Good (In addition to 3, risks and corrective measures identified) 5- Excellent (In addition to 4, demonstration of additional information addressing requirements of the study)</p>		20
3.2.	Report writing: Evidence of previous bid in	Report writing and Communication(parameters): write clear, concise and focused reports ⁶ that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show		15

⁶ Impact Evaluation Report (Evidence of previous bid in similar projects and submitted), this must be submitted.

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Score (out of 5)	Weighting
	similar projects and submitted.	<p>the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other.</p> <p>0– Unacceptable (None of the parameters mentioned above were met and there were severe shortcomings in the evaluation report)</p> <p>1 – Poor (Most parameters mentioned above were not met and there were major shortcomings in the evaluation report)</p> <p>2 – Average (More than one parameter mentioned above was unmet with significant shortcomings in the evaluation report)</p> <p>3 – Good (All parameters mentioned above were fully met with minor shortcomings in the evaluation report)</p> <p>4 – Very Good (All parameters mentioned above were fully met and there were no shortcomings in the evaluation report)</p> <p>5- Excellent (in addition to 4, risks discussed in the evaluation report)</p>		
			Total:	100

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

12.3. Phase 3: Price and BEE Contribution status level

Please note that only service providers that scores 70% and above on functionality will be evaluated on price and BEE

The bid price must be inclusive of VAT and quoted in RSA currency

	80/20 PRINCIPLE	POINTS
1	Price	80
2	B-BBEE status level of contribution	20
	MAXIMUM POINTS	100

The 80/20 Preference points system will be applied using the below formula to calculate price:

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

Where,

Ps = Points scored for comparative price of bid under consideration

Pt = Comparative price of bid under consideration

Pmin = Comparative price of lowest acceptable bid

In terms of Regulation 5 (2) and 6 (2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table as set out in the Preference Points Claim Form (SBD 6.1).

B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor	Number of Points
1	20
2	18
3	16
4	12
5	8
6	6

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022

B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor	Number of Points
7	4
8	2
Non-compliant contributor	0

13. General

The awarding of the final contract is subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the DSBD and the successful service provider.

14. Enquiries

Contact Details and Enquiries

13.1 Tender enquiries

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

13.2 Technical Enquiries to the Evaluation team

Name: Ms Ramadumetja Langa
 Director: Monitoring and Evaluation
 Telephone Number: 066 110 9877
 Email: PLanga@dsbd.gov.za

Name: Ms Nthambeleni Seshibedi
 Deputy Director: Monitoring and Evaluation
 Telephone Number: 066 110 8832
 Email: NDseshibedi@dsbd.gov.za

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
 Seda
 Final Version July 2022

14. BID INFORMATION -Move towards the end

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

15. PROPOSAL FORMAT

- **Annexure A** must contain the published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure B** must contain the proposal and services offered.
- **Annexure C** must contain the total number of employees and the number of employees from Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDI) and number of women, youth and person with disabilities.
- **Annexure D** must contain a summary of qualifications of employees and past experience.
- **Annexure E** must contain pricing information.
- **Annexure F** must contain all other forms / certificates required (SBDs, Tax clearance certificate etc. – see bid documents).

16. CONDITIONS OF BID

a. Administrative compliance

See bid documents

b. Functional Evaluation

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

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

c. Price evaluation: The PPPFA

See bid documents

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),
Seda
Final Version July 2022

ANNEXURE A

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

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

ToR Approved

YES

☐

NO

☐

Date: _____

¹ STP Incubation Policy, June 2015

¹ STP Incubation Policy, 2018

¹ Incubation Actual Spend as per Annual Financial Statements (AFS),

Seda

Final Version July 2022