



| | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Tender Ref #: | COGTA (T) 18/2023 | Tender Description: | APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER FROM SITA RFB1183/2022 ENGAGEMENT MODEL TO UPDATE THE MASTER SYSTEMS PLAN (MSP) FOR THE NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT CENTRE (NDMC) |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|

PART A – BID DETAILS

1. The Department of Cooperative Governance (hereunder referred to as the Department or DCOG) invites qualifying bidders from **SITA RFB1183/2022 Engagement Model** to update the Master Systems Plan for the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC).
2. **Closing Date:** The bid closing date and time are indicated in the tender advertisement and bid documents (SBD-1). **Bids received after the closing date and time will not be accepted.**
3. **Briefing Session:** The briefing session date and time (if applicable) are indicated in the tender advertisement and bid documents. The Department cannot physically accommodate the expected number of bidders and the briefing will therefore be conducted online. Interested bidders must contact the SCM officials indicated below for the MS Teams link.
4. **Contact information:** Prospective bidders **may not under any circumstances** contact or engage any DCOG officials other than the officials indicated below on any matter related to this tender. Enquiries must be directed to all the officials below. Enquiries sent to the DCOG officials below will be routed to the relevant employees and responses will be coordinated and provided by the officials indicated below.

| ENQUIRIES | |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| Name: | Siviwe Ndaliso |
| e-mail: | t18.2023@cogta.gov.za |

The Department reserves the right to disqualify any bidder that makes contact with or directly engages any other DCOG employee on matters / enquiries / questions related to this tender.

5. **Project duration:** Successful bidders will be appointed up to 8 months.

6. **Bid / Proposal format**

Bidders should submit their proposals in line with the terms of reference which comprise Four packages:

Package 1: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 1: Summary of the Bidders experience and project execution plan”

The following must be submitted – :

- 1.1 The company profile indicating expertise in developing / updating Master Systems Plans (MSP);
- 1.2 Number of reference letters indicating projects completed in specific areas;
- 1.3 Proposal and project execution plan addressing the scope and deliverables that defines the:

- Milestones that are 100% aligned to each of the key objectives as well as each of the expected outputs/ deliverables as outlined in the scope of work.
- Timelines (Gantt chart) for each of the activities and deliverables.
- Allocation of Human Resources
- Cost-breakdown of each of the activities and deliverables.
- Proposed Governance Arrangements to support project implementation which may include but not limited to:

- The establishment of a project steering committee.
- The establishment of a project management team inclusive of the service provider and the DCoG team.
- Provision of secretariat support for the governance structures that will be established.
- Skills transfer plan

Package 2: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 2: Expertise and accreditation of project team”

The following must be submitted – :

Bidders must include detailed CVs including copies of applicable product certification. The CV template is attached. **(Annexure B)**

- 2.1 CV of the dedicated lead Enterprise Architect (SITA ICN 81112011-0017) who will be assigned for the duration of the project who is TOGAF certified and have at least 2 years experience on similar projects.
- 2.2 CV of the dedicated Business analyst (SITA ICN 81112011-0011) who will be assigned to the project and have at least 2 years experience in business and data analysis.
- 2.3 CV of the key project manager (SITA ICN 81112011-0005) who will be assigned to the project
- 2.4 CV of the ICT Governance and Compliance manager (SITA ICN 81112011-0007) who will be assigned to the project

Package 3: Marked “Pricing information”

The price proposal must include 15% VAT and must be fully inclusive to deliver all services and outputs indicated in the terms of reference.

The price proposal must be fixed and itemised per deliverable. **(Annexure A)**

Package 4: Marked “Bid Documents”

- SDBs 1, 3.2, 4 and 6.1 all other required SCM documents.
- National Treasury Central Suppliers Database (CSD) report, not older than 30 days (www.csd.gov.za).

PART B –ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFIC GOALS

General principle: In cases where bidders submitted insufficient evidence or where evidence is ambiguous, bidders may be requested to provide additional evidence and may be re-scored based on this information. Additional information submitted may only be used as evidence to substantiate what is already contained in the proposal. **The costing and content of proposals may not be amended under any circumstances.**

1. BID DOCUMENTS – To be verified by SCM

Only bids that comply with all mandatory administrative requirements and that submitted all required bid documents (**acceptable bids**) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. Only acceptable bids will therefore be scored by the Bid Evaluation Committee against the functional criteria indicated in Part C

| SCM ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| # | Criteria | Yes / No |
| 1.1 | Supplier is registered on the National Treasury Central Suppliers Database (CSD) on or before bid closing date. | |
| 1.2 | Supplier is Tax Compliant (as indicated on CSD) ¹ or verified through SARS ¹ | |
| 1.3 | Supplier has a valid B-BBEE certificate issued by a SANAS accredited verification agency or a sworn affidavit ² . | |
| 1.4 | SBD 1 completed and submitted. | |
| 1.5 | SBD 3.3 completed and submitted. | |
| 1.6 | SBD 4 completed and submitted. | |
| 1.7 | SBD 6.1 completed and submitted. | |
| 1.8 | Annexure A completed | |
| 1.9 | Annexure B completed | |

Note 1: Bidders that are not tax compliant on the closing date for bids or at any time subsequent to the closing date, must rectify their tax compliance status within 7 working days of being requested to do so. Bidders that remain tax non-compliant after 7 working days of being requested to rectify their tax status, will be disqualified.

Note 2: Failure to submit a valid B-BBEE certificate issued by a SANAS accredited verification agency or a sworn affidavit will not disqualify the bidder. Consortia or joint ventures must take note of the relevant sections of SBD 6.1 regarding requirements for B-BEEE certificates.

2. VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION PROVIDED – To be verified by SCM

No bids will be considered from:

1. Individuals in the service of the State.
2. Organisations with directors (whether remunerated or not) in the service of the State.

Where exceptions are allowed in terms of the applicable legislation, the bidder must attach an approved and valid Remunerative Work Outside of the Public Service (RWOPS). This clause does not apply to bidders that are government departments/entities.

The Department reserves the right to use the information provided by bidders to engage banks, credit rating agencies and the relevant government institutions to obtain information on credit records, criminal records, pending court cases, etc. Suppliers that show a history of poor financial/credit management and/or criminal behaviour will not be considered. The same will apply to the key team members as well as all directors / owners.

The Department reserves the right to apply the following criteria only to shortlisted / recommended bidders. Bidders must meet all four criteria below:

| SCM ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| # | Criteria | Yes / No |
| 2.1 | Team members, Director(s)/Owner(s) have not been convicted on charges related to fraud, corruption or violent/abusive behaviour. | |
| 2.2 | Bidder and team members, Director(s)/Owner(s) do not have a history of poor financial / credit management. | |
| 2.3 | No team members, Director(s)/Owner(s) in the service of the state, or approved RWOPS attached where in the service of the state. This clause does not apply to bidders that are government departments/entities. | |
| 2.4 | SBD forms or subsequent enquiries did not reveal any information or past practices that prohibits the supplier from conducting business with the state. | |

MANDATORY REQUIREMENT

Failure to submit the below listed documents will render your bid null and void and will not be considered or will be disqualified.

| Mandatory Requirement | | |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| # | Criteria | Yes / No |
| 3.1 | Package 1: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 1: Summary of the Bidders experience and project execution plan” | |
| 3.2 | Package 2: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 2: Expertise and accreditation of project team” | |
| 3.3 | Package 3: Marked “Pricing information” | |

3. SPECIFIC GOALS

| 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) |
|---|---|--|
| BEE Compliance Based on Section 10 of the BBBEE Act (Act 53 of 2003 as amended by Act 46 of 2013) | <p>8</p> <p>Level 1= 8 pts Level 2 = 7 pts Level 3=6 pts Level 4= 5 pts Level 5= 4 pts Level 6= 3 pts Level 7= 2 pts Level 8= 1 pt</p> <p>Non-compliant contributor= 0</p> | |
| Black ownership (51% or more) | 4 | |
| Women ownership (51% or more) | 4 | |
| Youth | 3 | |
| Disability | 1 | |

PART C – FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION – To be evaluated by the BEC

General principle: In cases where bidders submitted insufficient evidence or where evidence is ambiguous, bidders may be requested to provide additional evidence and may be re-scored based on this information. Additional information submitted may only be used as evidence to substantiate what is already contained in the proposal. **The costing and content of proposals may not be amended under any circumstances.**

Each Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) member will evaluate acceptable bids based on the proposals and bid documents submitted. The following scoring system will be applied to the evaluation of all functional criteria:

| Scoring system |
|--|
| 0- Does not meet any of the minimum requirements |
| 1- Meet one of the minimum requirements |
| 2- Meet two of the minimum requirements |
| 3- Meet three of the minimum requirements |
| 4- Exceeds three minimum requirements |

The **Score obtained for each criterium** will be calculated by multiplying the score awarded by a BEC member by the weight for that criterium. The **overall score for a BEC member** will be expressed as a percentage (Total weighted score divided by the maximum possible score, then multiplied by 100). The **overall score obtained by a bidder** will be the average of overall scores awarded by BEC Members (rounded to the nearest whole number). Only Bidders that received the indicated minimum overall scores will proceed to Part D – Price Evaluation and Award.

Where functional evaluation is conducted in stages, bidders must meet the minimum overall score for a particular stage to proceed to the next stage and only bidders that met the minimum overall scores for all stages will proceed to Part D – Price Evaluation

The Bid Evaluation Committee may:

- Evaluate and score bids based on the bid documents and proposals submitted; or
- Provisionally evaluate and score bidders based on proposals submitted and then invite bidders that met all mandatory administrative requirements to present their bids.

The final evaluation and scoring of bids will be based on the proposals submitted, as well as on information provided by bidders during bid presentations (if applicable). Presentations can be used to summarise and clarify bids and may not substantially depart from the proposals submitted.

If a bidder is unable to attend a bid presentation on the date requested by the Bid Evaluation Committee, then the bidder must be afforded another opportunity within 5 working days. If a bidder is for a second time unable to attend a bid presentation then the bid must be evaluated based on the bid documents and proposals submitted only.

FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION STAGE 1

STAGE 1 CRITERIA

| | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------------|
| 1.1 | Company profile indicating expertise in developing or updating Master Systems Plans (MSP) | Weight | 8 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| No company profile provided | | | 0 |
| Company profile provided, with 2 years experience in developing or updating MSPs. | | | 1 |
| Company profile provided, with 3 years experience in developing or updating MSPs. | | | 2 |
| Company profile provided, with 4 years experience in developing or updating MSPs. | | | 3 |
| Company profile provided, with at least 5 or more years experience in developing or updating MSPs. | | | 4 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|
| 1.2 | Number of reference letters submitted for disaster management related projects covering the following areas: a) preventing or reducing the risk of disasters; b) mitigating the severity or consequences of disasters; c) emergency preparedness; d) rapid and effective response to disasters; and e) post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation. | Weight | 5 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| No reference letters provided and not meeting the requirements above. | | | 0 |
| One letter provided. | | | 1 |
| Two letters provided. | | | 2 |
| Three letters provided. | | | 3 |
| Four or more letters provided. | | | 4 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|
| 1.3 | Bidder detailed work-plan with implementation plan and budget containing cost-breakdowns according to the deliverables (as per the proposal): a) Clearly defined milestones that are 100% aligned to each of the key objectives. b) Well defined timelines for each of the activities and deliverables. c) Allocation of additional human Resources and skills. d) Allocation of Cost-breakdown of each of the activities and deliverables. e) Proposed Governance Arrangements to support project implementation | Weight | 12 |
| Description | | | Score |
| Does not adequately address point (a) above. | | | 0 |
| Adequately addresses only point (a) above. | | | 1 |
| Adequately addresses point (a) and (b) above. | | | 2 |
| Adequately addresses point (a)(b)(c) and (d) above. | | | 3 |
| Adequately addresses all five (5) of the elements listed above. | | | 4 |

STAGE 1 SCORING SUMMARY

| Criterium | Weight | Score | Weighted score | Maximum possible score |
|---|-----------|------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 1.1 | 8 | | | 32 |
| 1.2 | 5 | | | 20 |
| 1.3 | 12 | | | 48 |
| TOTAL | 25 | - | | 100 |
| Overall Score (Total Weighted Score / 100) | | % | | -- |
| Minimum qualifying overall score | | 70% | | |

FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION STAGE 2

STAGE 2 CRITERIA

| | | | |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|
| 2.1 | Provide a CV for a dedicated lead ICT Enterprise Architect (SITA ICN 81112011-0017) who will be assigned for the duration of the project. The lead ICT Enterprise Architect must be TOGAF certified and have at least 2 years on similar projects. | Weight | 10 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| Lead enterprise architect does not have TOGAF certification with no similar projects. | | | 0 |
| Lead enterprise architect does have TOGAF certification with at least 2 years on similar projects. | | | 1 |
| Lead enterprise architect does have TOGAF certification with at least 3 years on similar projects. | | | 2 |
| Lead enterprise architect does have TOGAF certification with at least 4 years on similar projects. | | | 3 |
| Lead enterprise architect does have TOGAF certification with more than 5 years on similar projects. | | | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------------|
| 2.2 | Provide a CV for a dedicated Business Analyst (SITA ICN 81112011-0011) with at least 2 years' experience in business and data analysis. | Weight | 5 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| No experience. | | | 0 |
| Less than two years experience. | | | 1 |
| More than two years experience, but less than 5 years. | | | 2 |
| More than five years experiences, but less than 8 years. | | | 3 |
| 8 or more years experience. | | | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------|--------------|
| 2.3 | Experience and accreditation of key project manager (SITA ICN 81112011-0005) Requirements) as far as possible to be deployed for the project: a) PMBOK b) PRINCE 2 | Weight | 5 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| Project manager with no accreditation and no project management qualification. | | | 0 |
| Project manager with at least 1 accreditation and 1 year of experience with MSP projects. | | | 1 |
| Project manager with at least 1 accreditation and 2 to 3 years' experience with MSP projects. | | | 2 |
| Project manager with at least 1 accreditation and 3 to 4 years of experience with MSP projects. | | | 3 |
| Project manager with at least 1 accreditation and 4 or more years of experience with MSP projects. | | | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------------|
| 2.4 | Experience and certification of an ICT Governance and Compliance manager (SITA ICN 81112011-0007) who is proficient in corporate governance, enterprise risk management and regulatory compliance. The certification required is a certification in risk and information systems control (CRISC). | Weight | 5 |
| Evaluation | | | Score |
| No experience and no certification. | | | 0 |
| One year experience with no certification. | | | 1 |
| One year experience with certification. | | | 2 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Two years experience with certification. | 3 |
| Three or more years experience with certification. | 4 |

STAGE 2 SCORING SUMMARY

| Criterium | Weight | Score | Weighted score | Maximum possible score |
|---|-----------|------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 2.1 | 10 | | | 40 |
| 2.2 | 5 | | | 20 |
| 2.3 | 5 | | | 20 |
| 2.4 | 5 | | | 20 |
| TOTAL | 25 | - | | 100 |
| Overall Score (Total Weighted Score / 100) | | % | | -- |
| Minimum qualifying score | | 70% | | |

PART D – PRICE EVALUATION AND AWARD– To be evaluated by the BEC

Only bids that met all administrative requirements and the minimum functional requirements will be evaluated in terms of the provisions of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations – see attached bid documents. The evaluation method (80/20) and preference points allocation applicable to this bid are indicated in the attached SBD 6.1.

PART E –SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

SPECIAL CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THIS BID

- 3.1. The Department may, at its sole discretion, cancel this bid.
- 3.2. The period of thirty days (30 days) referred to in the General Conditions of Contract paragraph 27.2 applies. If the service provider is found to have engaged in fraudulent activities or caused the Department to incur irregular expenditure, the Department reserves the right to cancel the bid and any subsequent SLA with immediate effect. Repercussions for the conduct of the Service Provider referred to above may include blacklisting of the Service Provider thus preventing them from doing business with government for a period of 10 years.
- 3.3. The Department may, at its own discretion, require that each employee of appointed services providers as well as each contractor or other participant, sign a code of conduct to promote ethical behaviour. The Department may, at its sole discretion, prohibit any person found to be in breach of such code of conduct from further participation or involvement in the project.
- 3.4. Additional conditions for an applicant who would like to apply as a Consortium / Joint Venture. It is recognized that applicants may wish to form consortia or joint ventures to respond to this bid. The following guidelines apply:
 - Bidders are prohibited from being part of more than one consortium / joint venture and to submit an individual bid and a bid as part of a consortium / joint venture
 - One of the members shall be nominated by the others as authorised to be the lead applicant and this authorisation shall be included in the agreement entered between the consortium members.
 - The lead applicant in the Consortium or Joint Venture must satisfy all the administrative requirements contained in the ToR and submit all the relevant documents necessary to meet the minimum requirements of the applications.
 - Other members of a consortium or a joint venture must comply with the requirements in line with Service Provider Funding Policy prescripts for the respective Service Provider categories.
 - The consortium/joint venture submission must be signed-off by each institution/organisation to be legally binding on all consortium members.
 - The lead applicant shall be the only authorised party to make legal statements, communicate with the department, and receive instructions for and on behalf of all the members of the consortium.
 - The lead applicant shall be held responsible for the delivery of services and for meeting conditions outlined in this bid.

- A copy of the agreement entered and signed by all members of the consortium or joint venture shall be submitted with the consortium proposal indicating the respective responsibilities of each party.
- Indicate how the joint venture/ consortium will be managed in the event of a dispute arising during the implementation period of the programme (Provide a contingency plan of managing any possible conflicts).

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

3.5. The successful bidder will be required to enter into a service level agreement (SLA) with the Department of Cooperative governance. The National Treasury General Conditions of Contract (GCC) will form part of the SLA to be concluded between DCOG and the successful bidder.

3.6. The SLA will include project assignments that will address each of the project deliverables. The SLA may further establish a Project Steering Committee to manage, monitor and oversee the project such as:

- Ensure that services are rendered timeously.
- render a quality assurance function; and
- ensure that the project remains within the allocated budget.

3.7. The SLA will include a detailed payment schedule. Payments will therefore only be approved and processed based on the achievement of deliverables as per the implementation plan and/or project plan and related performed project tasks.

3.8. If the parties (the Department and the appointed service provider) are unable to reach agreement on the special conditions of contract (SLA) after a period of 14 calendar days of the date on which the bid award is communicated to the service provider, then the Department reserves the right to cancel the award to the service provider and to appoint another service provider.

3.9. Bidders should note that:

- All information related to this bid, or information provided to the service provider subsequent to the award of this bid, must be treated as confidential and may not be disclosed in any way to third parties without the explicit written consent of DCOG.
- All rights, title and ownership of any Intellectual Property developed by or for the Service Provider or DCOG independently and outside of execution/production of the Deliverables related to this bid and provided during the course of this project (“Background IP”) shall remain the sole property of the party providing the Background IP.
- To the extent that the Service Provider utilises any of its Background IP in connection with the Deliverables, such Background IP shall remain the property of the Service Provider and DCOG shall acquire no right or interest therein. Service Provider shall grant DCOG a non-exclusive, royalty-free, non-transferable licence to use such Background IP strictly for purposes of making beneficial use of the Deliverables into which such Background IP has been incorporated.
- All Intellectual Property rights in Bespoke Deliverables are or will be vested in and owned by DCOG unless specifically agreed otherwise in writing. The Service Provider agrees that it shall not, under any circumstances, question or dispute the rights and ownership of DCOG in and to the Bespoke Deliverables. DCOG shall grant the Service Provider a non-exclusive, royalty free, non-transferable licence to use the Bespoke Deliverables for the purpose of performing its obligations under this project.
- The Service Provider may not publish or sell, in whole or in part, any Bespoke Deliverables emanating from this project without the explicit written consent of DCOG.
- The Copyright of any Bespoke Deliverables shall vest in DCOG.

3.10. No amendments to the SLA or any variation, waiver, relaxation or suspension of any of the provisions thereof shall have any force or effect, unless reduced to writing and signed by both parties.

PART F – DETAILED REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to appoint an external service provider, via SITA RFB1183/2022 Engagement Model to update the existing Master Systems Plan (MSP) for the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC). The validity of the completed MSP document must cover a period of five (5) years, and will aim to develop Information

Communication Technology (ICT) over this period to become a true business enabler, that can actively support the NDMC's business processes.

2. Introduction and background

The National Disaster Management Framework of 2005 comprises four key performance areas (KPAs) and three supportive enablers required to achieve the objectives set out in the KPAs. The KPAs and enablers are informed by specified objectives and, as required by the Act, key performance indicators (KPIs) to guide and monitor progress. In addition, each KPA and enabler concludes with a list of guidelines that will be disseminated by the NDMC to support the implementation of the framework in all three spheres of government.

Link to framework: <http://www.ndmc.gov.za/Frameworks/Disaster%20Management%20Framework.pdf>

Enabler 1 focuses on priorities related to the establishment of an integrated and comprehensive information management and communication system for disaster risk management. More specifically, it addresses the information and communication requirements of each KPA and Enablers 2 and 3 emphasises the need to establish integrated communication links with all disaster risk management role players in national, provincial and municipal spheres of government.

The previous NDMC MSP was updated in 2010, valid till 2013. In 2012 the centre engaged with State Information Technology Agency (SITA) to assist in formulating the NDMC Strategic ICT plan. The plan addressed the following:

- a) articulating the NDMC's business strategy;
- b) interpreting key information drivers and information systems;
- c) conducting a detail assessment of the current ICT environment (applications, infrastructure, ICT human resources, projects portfolio and service delivery);
- d) developing the desired future state of the ICT environment that will support the business goals; and
- e) establishing a strategic ICT plan.

3. Problem Statement

The NDMC has fallen behind in implementing a strategic information systems plan which will give a holistic guidance to the NDMC on how best to utilize ICT to handle the administration, management and reporting functions from local, districts, metros offices till the lower level for successful disaster delivery.

4. Scope of the assignment

The ICT Master Systems Plan (MSP) must provide for the existing and desired functionalities. It should also provide for a future enhancement and development of the ICT Infrastructure, Application Systems, and the Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) environment. The scope of the project shall therefore entail:

- a) An analysis and evaluation of the existing ICT Infrastructure, Application Systems, and the Information Technology Service Management environment.
- b) Identify technology gaps between the current infrastructure and the strategic vision of the NDMC.
- c) Identify candidate technologies.
- d) Evaluate and update the existing ICT strategy
- e) Establish Operating Standards.
- f) Provide a functional description of the envisaged technology infrastructure.
- g) Provide an analysis of the requirements needed to develop, implement and maintain the ITSM environment of the Department.
- h) Cost estimate for the deployment of the proposed systems.
- i) Risk analysis and impact assessment.

5. Deliverables (Solution Components)

The MSP must be done in the context of the Disaster Management Act (DMA), 2002 (Act No. 57 of 2002). In the DMA, the integrated disaster risk management database an information management model explains the relationship between Enabler 1 and the rest of the 4 Key Performance Areas (KPA), including Enabler 2 and Enabler 3.

The request from the NDMC is to do a comparative analysis to identify the difference (a gap analysis) between the actual or current system and the desired, future system, as described in the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF) and develop a roadmap to inform the development process.

The MSP is required to provide a long-term vision for information systems and information technology and encapsulates the strategic vision for the ICT technological environment that the NDMC would like to establish over the next five years. This creates a consensus of how information technology can best be used in supporting the Centre's strategic objectives.

The plan also provides guidance and information on adopted and proposed standards that will lead the Centre to an open systems environment.

The MSP is therefore designed to assist the Centre in making informed decisions when choosing appropriate system specifications to meet current and planned requirements.

- a) Analysis and evaluation of the existing ICT Infrastructure, Application Systems, and the Information Technology Service Management environment completed.
- b) List of identified technology gaps between the current infrastructure and the strategic vision of the NDMC.
- c) List of identified candidate technologies.
- d) Evaluated and updated the ICT strategy
- e) Established Operating Standards.
- f) Provided a functional description of the new technology infrastructure needed.
- g) Requirements provided to develop, implement and maintain the ITSM environment of the Department.
- h) Cost estimate developed for the deployment of the proposed systems.
- i) Risk analysis and impact assessment provided

A) Analysis and evaluation of the existing ICT Infrastructure, Application Systems, and the Information Technology Service Management environment completed.

Gather information from across all three spheres of Government, namely: National, Provincial and Municipal spheres that will be used as a basis for the current situation (As is). Due to time constraints, the information gathering effort will focused on only one functional Disaster Management Centre within each sphere of Government.

The following Disaster Management Centres will be engaged:

- National Sphere - National Disaster Management Center
- Provincial Sphere – Two provincial Disaster Management Center – (Western Cape and Gauteng)
- Municipal Sphere – Two municipal Disaster Management Center – (City of Cape Town and City of Tshwane)

B) The conceptual future technologies for the ICT Infrastructure, Application Systems, and the Information Technology Service Management environment.

In line with the Disaster Management Framework (DMF), after evaluating the gap between the "as is" and "to be" the MSP will cater for:

- An updated ICT strategy, in line with Enabler 1 from the DMF that includes identifying the most appropriate ICT systems to capture, store, manipulate and disseminate data/management information and other tools for the benefit of all users and stakeholders. Artificial Intelligence systems including Open Source should also be considered.
- Determining and recommending the most appropriate hardware and software technologies that will meet the NDMC's requirements, including cloud solutions.
- Making provision for Knowledge Management as a service to the NDMC.

C) The cost estimate and schedule for the deployment of the proposed ICT Master Systems Plan

- Budgetary estimates for the proposed systems, including Terms of Reference (TOR) that can be used for internal procurement to buy the Commercial of the Shelf (COTS) systems.

- D) A management report that provides a high level, holistic view of the ICT Master Systems Plan in terms of the findings and suggestions
- E) Signing-off and approval ICT Master Systems Plan by the department after completion of all the deliverables.

6. Skills, Knowledge and experience requirements must be clearly and well-articulated in the CV's

It is required from an Enterprise Architect to ensure the alignment of the following within the NDMC; strategy with its external environment, business process, rules and information with the strategy, business systems with the processes, rules and information, IT solutions with the business systems, and IT infrastructure with the IT solutions. This is achieved by implementing and maintaining a knowledgebase repository, and establishing and maintaining an enterprise architecture baseline for the NDMC.

Operational skill(s) specification

- Conceptual skills
- Analytical skills
- Design skills
- Report writing skills
- Communication skills
- Interpersonal skills

Description of skills requirement

- Assess the availability of and do the alignment of programme performance information as required by government legislation.
- Articulate and/or model all the relevant programme performance information.
- Ensure the establishment of the environment within the NDMC to implement the MSP
- Implementation of NDMC knowledgebase repository

7. Form of proposal

Bidders should submit their proposals in line with paragraph 6 of Part A of the terms of reference which comprise Four packages:

Package 1: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 1: Summary of the Bidders experience and project execution plan”

The following must be submitted – :

- 1.1. The company profile indicating expertise in developing / updating Master Systems Plans (MSP);
- 1.2. Number of reference letters indicating projects completed in specific areas;
- 1.3. Proposal and project execution plan addressing the scope and deliverables that defines the:

- Milestones that are 100% aligned to each of the key objectives as well as each of the expected outputs/ deliverables as outlined in the scope of work.
- Timelines (Gantt chart) for each of the activities and deliverables.
- Allocation of Human Resources
- Cost-breakdown of each of the activities and deliverables.
- Proposed Governance Arrangements to support project implementation which may include but not limited to:
 - The establishment of a project steering committee.
 - The establishment of a project management team inclusive of the service provider and the DCoG team.
 - Provision of secretariat support for the governance structures that will be established.
- Skills transfer plan

Package 2: Marked “Functional Evaluation Stage 2: Expertise and accreditation of project team”

The following must be submitted – :

Bidders must include detailed CVs including copies of applicable certification. The CV template is attached. **(Annexure B)**

Failure to submit these documents with the bid will result in the bidder's bid being viewed as invalid and therefore rejected.

Package 3: Marked “Pricing information”

The price proposal must include 15% VAT and must be fully inclusive to deliver all services and outputs indicated in the terms of reference.

The pricing must include the following: **(Use ANNEXURE A)**

- Rates of each team member per hour as per Annexure A.
- Admin costs (offices, computers, telecom, travelling, etc.)
- Any other costs (to be specified by bidder)
- Value Added Tax
- Ceiling price (all-inclusive total tender price)
- NB: pricing should be detailed (itemised) – must show cost separately and total.

The price proposal must be fixed and itemised per deliverable.

Package 4: Marked “Bid Documents”

- SDBs 1, 3.2, 4 and 6.1 all other required SCM documents.
- National Treasury Central Suppliers Database (CSD) report, not older than 30 days (www.csd.gov.za).

Failure to submit the packages in the bid will result in the bidder's bid to be viewed as invalid and therefore rejected.

Budget Estimate (ANNEXURE A)

| Role | Quantity | Rate per hour | Maximum hours | Total Excluding VAT | Total Including VAT |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Enterprise Architect | 1 | | 400 | | |
| Business Analyst | 1 | | 800 | | |
| Project Manager | 1 | | 700 | | |
| ICT Governance and compliance manager | 1 | | 320 | | |
| Admin costs | | | | | |
| Other costs | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | |

CV TEMPLATE (ANNEXURE B)

| Item | Details |
|---------------|--|
| Full Name | |
| Surname | |
| Experience | (e.g. 3 years' experience in) |
| Qualification | Qualification 1: (Attach certified copy) Name of Qualification: Institution: Year Obtained: |
| | Qualification 2: (Attach certified copy) Name of Qualification: Institution: Year Obtained: |