

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR

SOURCING INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES TO CONDUCT A FINANCIAL

MANAGEMENT REVIEW FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE SECTOR EDUCATION AND

TRAINING AUTHORITY (PSETA) IN LINE WITH THE APPROVED 2026/2027

INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN'S QUARTER 3 DELIVERABLES.

RFP/

CLOSING DATE: 28 AUGUST 2026

1. PURPOSE

To provide service providers with the necessary background and information to submit a detailed proposal for conducting the following review in quarter 3 of 2026/2027:

- **Financial Management Review (Ref. 2026/27-11)**

PSETA wants to obtain a comprehensive response (clear and unambiguous) from bidders in terms of their ability to support the delivery of the relevant services.

2. BACKGROUND

PSETA is established in terms of section 9(1) and (2) of the Skills Development Act (Act No. 97 of 1998 as amended). The Skills Development Act is PSETA's enabling legislation and guides its operations as a sector education and training authority (SETA), as set out in section 10 of the Act.

For accountability purposes, the PSETA is a schedule 3A entity of the Public Management Finance Act (PFMA), with its own Accounting Authority which is accountable to the Minister of Higher Education, Science and Innovation. High level structuring of the entity consists of the following programmes:

- Programme 1: Administration
- Programme 2: Skills Planning and Research
- Programme 3: Learning Programmes and Projects
- Programme 4: Quality Assurance

3. RATIONALE FOR THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW.

3.1 PSETA Internal Audit comprises of a CAE and two (02) in-house internal audit staff members. To augment its capacity, the CAE has embarked on sourcing service providers to assist with the implementation of specific internal audit projects, as approved by the Audit Committee.

3.2 The approved 2026/2027 Internal Audit Plan has, as part of its quarter 3 deliverables, planned assurance on PSETA's financial management functions.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW

PSETA internal audit is seeking a service provider to provide internal audit review to evaluate whether internal controls are adequate and effective to achieve complete, accurate records and compliant financial records.

5. SCOPE OF WORK

The following audit scope of applies for the audit project:

- 5.1 Revenue and Budget / Expenditure Management.
- 5.2 Payment Processing, including Payroll
- 5.3 Creditors and Debtors Management
- 5.4 Commitment Register.
- 5.5 Management of Irregular and Fruitless Expenditure
- 5.6 Follow-up on internal and external audit findings
- 5.7 Validation of Reported Performance Information (30 days invoice payments)

6. TIME FRAME

The audit review is planned to commence quarter 3 of 2026/2027, from 05 October 2026 and be completed by 20 November 2026, latest. As such, the allocation of capacity should consider the completion timelines as indicated.

7. KEY DELIVERABLES

7.1. PROJECT DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Explanation	Responsibility / Sign Off
Audit Planning Phase		
1. Project Kick-off	Opening / Audit Entrance Meeting	CAE and co-sourced service provider
2. Completed Declaration Forms	Declaration forms are completed prior commencement of actual audit work	Co-sourced service provider

Deliverable	Explanation	Responsibility / Sign Off
3. Audit Planning Memorandum	Development of an APM map timelines of audit process	Co-sourced service provider, signed off by CAE
4. Engagement Letter	Drafting of engagement letter to issue to audit client	Co-sourced service provider, signed off by CAE
5. System Description	Documenting system description	Co-sourced service provider – ensure signoff by audit client.
6. Audit Programme	Development of Audit Procedures for testing controls (Audit Programme)	Co-sourced service provider, signed off by CAE
7. Request for Information (RFI)	Prepare and issue and RFI for approved Audit Programme.	Co-sourced service provider
Execution Phase		
8. Execution of Audit Programme – completed audit working papers	Execute approved Audit Programme and complete relevant working papers	Co-sourced service provider
9. Informal Queries / Draft Findings	Draft informal queries as the audit progresses and discuss with management.	Co-sourced service provider
Reporting		
10. Draft Internal Audit Report	Draft internal audit report compiled and discussed with management.	Co-sourced service provider
11. Final Internal Audit Reports	Final draft internal audit report presented to CEO.	Co-sourced service provider and CAE
	Final report signed by co-signed by co-source provider and forwarded to CAE	Co-sourced service provider

Deliverable	Explanation	Responsibility / Sign Off
12. Client Satisfaction Survey	Issue of Client Satisfaction Survey form to audit client	Co-sourced service provider
13. Project Close Out	Quality Assured Audit File – 27 November 2026	Co-sourced service provider
14. Audit Committee Reporting	Presentation of Internal Audit Report to the Audit Committee – on request.	Co-sourced service provider

8. COMPETENCIES OF PROSPECTIVE SERVICE PROVIDER

The prospective service provider MUST satisfy required competencies as listed on the functionality criteria in 13 below to be considered.

9. ADMINISTRATION

The service provider must be a registered entity or consortium of companies, with traceable credential and should be able to assume duties immediately on appointment.

10. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- 10.1. The appointed service provider shall be required to report to the Chief Audit Executive of the PSETA
- 10.2. All work must be carried and reports finalised line with the Internal Audit methodology and approved working paper templates.
- 10.3. Payment will only take place after the requirements for specified deliverables have been met.

11. SUBMISSION OF THE PROPOSAL

The service provider should prepare an offer/proposal on how the assignment will be undertaken, a clear work plan, and curriculum vitae of the expert(s) as well as reference letters to support experience. The proposal must be concise and straight to the point.

12. RETENTION OF RECORDS

All the information derived and produced during the implementation, licensing, training as well as maintenance and support of the data analytics solution will remain the property of the PSETA.

13. PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND APPOINTMENT OF SERVICE PROVIDER

The proposals will be evaluated on the functionality criteria (phase 1) and 80/20 principle (phase 2) with 80 points being allocated for price and 20 points allocated for specific goals once the minimum functionality criteria are met.

PHASE 1: FUNCTIONALITY EVALUATION

Bids must meet the minimum eligibility criteria in respect of functionality of 75 points out of 100 points that will be awarded for functionality before they are considered further. Any bid that does not meet the minimum eligibility threshold will be automatically disqualified.

Below is the applicable functionality criteria for the bid:

DOMAIN	EVALUATION METHOD	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1. Qualifications of the proposed team (30)	1.1 NQF Level 7 academic qualification in Internal Audit, Auditing, Accounting or any Finance related qualification. <i>(NQF 8 or higher shall be an added advantage)</i> NB: Certified Copies (no older than 12 months) of Academic Qualifications should be attached.	5 = Engagement team member has attained NQF level 09 and above of the required academic qualification 4 = Engagement team member has attained NQF level 08 of required academic qualification. 3 = Engagement team member has attained NQF level 07 required academic qualification 2 = Engagement team member has attained NQF level 06 of the required academic qualification 1 = Engagement team member has attained <u>lower than</u> NQF6 of the required academic qualification <u>NB: Total score to be the average of all scores per engagement team member.</u>	10



DOMAIN	EVALUATION METHOD	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
	1.2 The proposed engagement to consist of at least 3 resources, inclusive of the Audit Director / Partner, who are professionally certified as CIA (mandatory for atleast 1 team member) and a CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA. <i>(More than 3 resources with listed professional qualifications shall be an added advantage).</i> NB: Certified Copies (no older than 12 months) of Professional Qualifications should be attached.	5 = 5 or more members of the proposed engagement team (including the Audit Director / Partner) collectively possess the required certifications (CIA <u>and</u> CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA). 4 = 4 members of the proposed engagement team (including the Audit Director / Partner) collectively possess the required certifications (CIA <u>and</u> CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA). 3 = At least 3 members of the proposed engagement team (including the Audit Director / Partner) collectively possess the required certifications (CIA <u>and</u> CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA). 2 = Only 2 members of the proposed engagement team (including the Audit Director / Partner) collectively possess the required certifications (CIA <u>and</u> CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA). 1 = Only 1 or 0 member of the proposed engagement team (including the Audit Director / Partner) possess the required certifications (CIA <u>and</u> CA(SA) / ACCA / RGA) <u>NB: Total score to be the average of all scores per engagement team member.</u>	20

DOMAIN	EVALUATION METHOD	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
2 Experience of the proposed engagement team (30)	Project Team Members should individually possess a minimum of 5 years experience in conducting internal audit engagements. <i>(Experience above the listed years to be an added advantage)</i> CVs detailing each members' qualifications and relevant experience should be attached	5 = Proposed team member possesses 10 years or more experience in conducting risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS). 4 = Proposed team member possesses 6 to 9 years' experience in conducting risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS). 3 = Proposed team member possesses 5 years' experience in conducting risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS). 2 = Proposed team member possesses 3 to 4 years' experience in conducting risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS). 1 = Proposed team member possesses <u>less than</u> 3 years' experience in conducting risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) <u>NB: Total score to be the average of all scores per engagement team member.</u>	30

DOMAIN	EVALUATION METHOD	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
3 Experience of Company / the Audit Firm (30)	The service provider must demonstrate, through submission of signed reference letters, completed financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years. i.e. 2021 to date. Each letter must include the following information: • Client letterhead and name • Description of the project • The contact person, phone number / email address • Completed Project Period <i>NB: Only the reference letters indicating all the requirements mentioned above will be considered.</i>	4 = 6 or more signed reference letters of completed risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years. 4 = 4 to 5 signed reference letters of completed risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years. 3 = 2 to 3 signed reference letters of completed risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years. 2 = 1 signed reference letter of completed risk-based audit financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years. 1 = 0 signed reference letters of completed risk-based financial management related audit engagements (Finance, Treasury; SCM, Review of AFS) in the past 5 years..	30

DOMAIN	EVALUATION METHOD	CRITERIA	WEIGHT
4 Membership with the Institute of Internal Auditors South Africa (IIASA) (10)	Proposed team members have active membership with the Institute of Internal Auditors South Africa (IIASA). Evidence of additional <u>active</u> memberships with other professional bodies such as SAICA, ACCA, RGA, ACFE, IRMSA, Ethics Institute of South Africa, Compliance Institute of South Africa, which enhances internal audit assurance expertise, shall be an added advantage.	5= Audit Director / Partner and at least 4 members of the proposed team hold active IIASA memberships PLUS 1 or more additional active certifications from professional bodies listed in the evaluation method. 4 = Audit Director / Partner and atleast 3 members of the proposed team hold active IIASA memberships PLUS 1 additional active certification from professional bodies listed in the evaluation method. 3 = Audit Director / Partner and atleast 2 members of the proposed team hold active IIASA memberships. 2 = Audit Director / Partner and 1 member of the proposed team hold active IIASA memberships 1 = 0 member of the proposed team hold active IIASA memberships	10

PHASE 2:

The bids will be evaluated on the 80/20 principle with 80 points being allocated for price and 20 points allocated for specific goal, once the minimum functionality criteria are met. The evaluation will be based on

		Points
Price		80
Special goals		20
Black owned company Bidder who has 51% to 100% black people ownership	8	
Women Bidder who has 51% to 100% women ownership	4	
Youth Bidder who has 51% to 100% youth ownership	5	
Disability Bidder who has 51% to 100% disability ownership	3	
Total		100

14. FORMAT OF THE BID SUBMISSION

14.1 Proposals must be submitted physically to our PSETA offices.

14.2 Submission of all applicable documents as indicated below:

- i. Certified copies of the director's ID's document (in order claim points for disability as per SBD 6.1)
- ii. Certified copy of BB-BEE certificate or sworn affidavit
- iii. Valid Tax compliance status (TCS) PIN or proof of exemption from SARS;
- iv. Copy of the registration document of the organisation (CIPC);
- v. Copy of the Central Supplier Database registration.

15. IMPORTANT MANDATORY INFORMATION FOR BIDDERS

15.1. All Standard Bidding documents (SBD) documents must be completed and signed.

- SBD 1 (All sections must be fully completed)
- SBD 4 (All sections must be fully completed)
- SBD 6.1 (All sections must be fully completed)
- Proof of registration on Central Supplier Database.
- General Conditions of Contract (All pages must be signed or initialled)

NB: Please note that failure to submit documents requested on section 15.1 will render the proposal disqualified.