



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT SERVICE PROVIDER TO CONDUCT A MARKET ANALYSIS OF PRICING REASONABLENESS, VALUE FOR MONEY, FAIRNESS OF PRICING AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN RESPECT OF THE BRM TRANSITION BETWEEN SASSA AND THE DOCUMENT WAREHOUSE.**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

The South African Social Security Agency (SASSA) is implementing a transition and handover process for the permanent withdrawal of beneficiary records from The Document Warehouse (TDW) to MEC Consortium under the broader Beneficiary Records Management (BRM) programme. The co-sourcing contract with TDW expired on 31 March 2026, and no active contract has been in place since 01 April 2026.

The Agency has a responsibility of ensuring that the beneficiary files are stored and managed in a manner that will preserve them for as long as they are needed. It also has to ensure that during their lifecycle they are safe, accounted for, retrievable and not damaged.

Co-Sourcing arrangement - SASSA had therefore entered into a co-source agreement with The Document Warehouse for the management of records since 2016. This was because it had knowledge and experience in the provision of Initial relocation of records, offsite storage, maintenance (of files), retrieval services, support services for files/records. The management of these beneficiary records took place through the Co-Source Arrangement – Storage, scanning, retrieval and destruction functions were performed by The Document Warehouse specializing in records management in Regions.

SASSA therefore is required to permanently remove the records from The Document Warehouse to a newly appointed service provider. SASSA therefore entered into negotiations with The Document Warehouse to develop a transitional and handover plan. Pricing schedules were therefore provided accordingly to SASSA by The Document Warehouse for the transitional and handover plan.

SASSA accordingly requires an independent and professionally defensible market analysis to assess the reasonableness of pricing, value for money, fairness of pricing and accountability implications associated with the services and invoices under consideration. This assignment is intended to support transparent, fair, equitable, competitive and cost-effective decision-making in accordance with section 217 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, the Public Finance Management Act, 1999, the Treasury Regulations issued thereunder, the Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2022, and SASSA's applicable Supply Chain Management policies and procedures.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

- 2.1 The purpose of these Terms of Reference is to appoint an independent, suitably qualified and experienced service provider to conduct a comprehensive market analysis and benchmarking exercise on the pricing, charges and cost structure associated with the BRM transition, storage, management, accommodation and permanent withdrawal services.
- 2.2 The analysis must determine whether the pricing submitted or invoiced is market-related, reasonable, fair, proportionate to the services rendered, defensible from a public procurement and audit perspective, and supportive of value for money.
- 2.3 Assess the market reasonability of the pricing submitted by the TDW in relation to storage-only services, permanent withdrawal unit pricing, management fees, office accommodation costs, and any other charges or invoices submitted.
- 2.4 Benchmark the TDW pricing against prevailing market rates, comparable service providers, historical contracted prices, and relevant industry norms for records management, document storage, records withdrawal, logistics, facilities-related accommodation, and associated management services.
- 2.5 The appointed service provider must further determine whether the pricing structure, escalation assumptions, regional variations and cost components are fair, justified, and proportionate to the scope of work and actual risk transferred to the TDW; assess whether the charges represent value for money for SASSA; identify any pricing anomalies, duplicated charges, inflated margins, or unsupported assumptions; and recommend pricing ranges, negotiation positions, cost ceilings and governance safeguards to support informed decision-making.

## 3. SCOPE OF WORK

The appointed service provider shall undertake a detailed analytical review of all relevant pricing information, supporting assumptions, commercial correspondence, invoice categories, historical contract pricing and market analysis data relevant to the BRM transition and handover process, including the following:

- 3.1 **Review the pricing proposals, invoices, breakdowns and correspondence relating to the BRM transition and handover process.**
  - 3.1.1 Analyze historical contract rates, including prior contracted permanent withdrawal rates and current or previous monthly service charges.
  - 3.1.2 Benchmark the fixed-cost storage-only proposal against comparable market rates on a regional and per-box basis.
  - 3.1.3 Benchmark permanent withdrawal unit pricing against market-related rates and comparable regional logistics and records withdrawal costs.

3.1.4 Assess the reasonability of Phase One and Phase Two management fees and office accommodation charges, including whether such charges are aligned to actual service requirements and market practice.

3.1.5 Examine the treatment of CPI increases, escalation assumptions, transition timing assumptions, regional variations and projected box volumes.

### **3.2 Governance, accountability and invoicing assessment**

3.2.1 Assess whether submitted monthly invoices align with any valid contractual, implied, residual or operational basis and whether invoice categories are adequately defined and justified.

### **3.3 Value for money and risk assessment**

3.3.1 Determine whether the pricing supports value for money, affordability, fairness and accountability from a public sector governance perspective, identify areas of pricing risk, over-recovery, ambiguity, or lack of substantiation, and provide practical recommendations on reasonable market ranges, negotiable items, unsupported items, items requiring further evidence, and items that should not be accepted without further validation.

## **4. DELIVERABLES**

### **THE APPOINTED SERVICE PROVIDER WILL BE REQUIRED TO DELIVER, AT A MINIMUM, THE FOLLOWING:**

4.1 An inception report setting out the proposed approach, work plan, information requirements and timelines.

4.2 A detailed benchmarking and analytical report addressing each objective and scope item.

4.3 The report must clearly explain the methodology, data sources, assumptions and limitations.

4.4 A schedule of analysed price items reflecting submitted prices, benchmark prices or ranges, variance analysis, reasonability findings and commentary.

4.5 A value-for-money assessment setting out whether the pricing is cost-effective, justified and defensible.

4.6 A fairness and accountability assessment addressing whether the charging and invoicing approach is transparent, properly categorized, and supportable in the prevailing circumstances.

4.7 A risk assessment which identifies cost, governance, legal and audit exposure arising from the pricing or invoices, together with recommendations including acceptable price ranges, non-negotiable concerns, negotiation leverage points and decision options for management.

- 4.8 An executive summary presentation suitable for submission to management, Supply Chain Management (SCM) structures, Bid Adjudication Committee (BAC) and/or Executive Committee (EXCO).

## 5. REQUIRED METHODOLOGY AND GOVERNANCE

- 5.1. The service provider must apply a rigorous, evidence-based and auditable methodology, including document review of all information provided by SASSA, market benchmarking using verifiable price sources, comparative analysis against similar records management, storage, withdrawal, warehousing, logistics and accommodation services in the South African market, and testing of assumptions, cost drivers, regional differentials and escalation factors.
- 5.2. The methodology must include assessment of total cost of ownership, value for money, fairness of pricing, reasonableness, proportionality, and identification of governance, accountability and expenditure risks, including potential exposure to irregular, fruitless and wasteful expenditure.
- 5.3. All findings must be supported by documentary evidence, transparent assumptions and clearly explained analytical methods. The final report must be suitable for governance scrutiny and capable of supporting internal decision-making, negotiation, legal consideration and audit review. All information received in the course of the assignment shall be treated as confidential.

## 6. TIMEFRAMES/DURATION OF CONTRACT

Given the urgency of the transition and the continued pricing uncertainty, the assignment must be completed within two (2) weeks from work commencement.

## 7. NATURE OF APPOINTMENT

This is a once-off professional services assignment linked to the BRM transition pricing analysis and not a recurring contract.

## 8. PRICING SCHEDULE

DESCRIPTION OF SERVICE	TOTAL EXCL. VAT	VAT 15%	TOTAL INCL. VAT
Inception report, market analysis, benchmarking report, pricing schedule analysis, value-for-money assessment, fairness and accountability assessment, risk assessment, recommendations and executive summary presentation for the BRM transition pricing analysis assignment.			

**NB:** The bidder must submit a firm once-off price for the full assignment. The quoted amount must cover all professional fees, analysis, benchmarking activities, reporting, meetings, travel, accommodation, administration and any other costs necessary to complete the assignment. No price escalation will be accepted for this once-off assignment. Pricing must be aligned to the

scope of work, required methodology, deliverables and expedited timeframes set out in these Terms of Reference.

## 9. BID EVALUATION CRITERIA

9.1 The evaluation process will be carried out in terms of the two (2) stages below.

9.2 The bid proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the 80/20 principle. The evaluation shall be conducted as follows:

### STAGE 1: Functionality Evaluation and Administrative Compliance

- ✓ **Phase one:** Functionality Evaluation
- ✓ **Phase two:** Administrative Compliance

#### Stage 1: Phase one - Functionality Evaluation

An assessment of Functionality will be based on the evaluation criteria noted in the table below. Each of the evaluation criteria will carry a weighting as indicated, and the bidder will be required to score a minimum of 65 points out of the 100 points for Functionality to qualify and proceed to the next stage of the evaluation process.

The criteria below will be evaluated according to the following values.

**Values: 1= Poor; 2=Average; 3= Good; 4 = Very good; 5= Excellent**

CRITERIA	FUNCTIONALITY EVALUATION	WEIGHT
<b>Approach and Methodology</b>	<p><b>Bidders must provide a methodology and detailed project plan with milestones, resource allocation and estimated completion dates within the two-weeks period.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the BRM transition pricing context, disputed cost components and the purpose of the assignment = <b>1</b></li> <li>• Unclear understanding of the BRM transition pricing context, disputed cost components and the purpose of the assignment = <b>2</b></li> <li>• Clear understanding of the BRM transition pricing context, disputed cost components and the purpose of the assignment including milestones, resource allocation and estimated completion dates within the two-weeks period = <b>3</b></li> <li>• Evidence-based BRM transition pricing context, disputed cost components and the purpose of the assignment including milestones, resource allocation and estimated completion dates within the two-weeks period = <b>4</b></li> </ul>	<b>30</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practical work plan for BRM transition pricing context, disputed cost components and the purpose of the assignment including milestones, resource allocation and estimated completion dates of less than two-weeks period = <b>5</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Relevant Sample Reports</b>	<p>Bidder must provide sample reports relevant to independent market analysis, benchmarking, value-for-money assessment or pricing reasonability reviews in records management, logistics, warehousing, facilities, procurement advisory or similar environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant sample report submitted = <b>1</b></li> <li>• One relevant sample report submitted = <b>2</b></li> <li>• Two relevant sample reports submitted = <b>3</b></li> <li>• Three relevant sample reports submitted = <b>4</b></li> <li>• Four or more relevant sample reports submitted = <b>5</b></li> </ul>	<b>25</b>
<b>Company Experience</b>	<p>A minimum of three (3) years or more experience in conducting market analysis, price benchmarking, value-for-money assessment, procurement advisory or related pricing review assignment and must submit the following:</p> <p>Signed contactable reference letters on client letterheads for previous similar assignments in market analysis, price benchmarking, value-for-money assessment, procurement advisory or related pricing review assignment. SASSA will conduct direct reference checks with the issuing client as part of the evaluation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One year experience = <b>1</b></li> <li>• Two years' experience = <b>2</b></li> <li>• Three years' experience = <b>3</b></li> <li>• Four years' experience = <b>4</b></li> <li>• Five or more years' experience = <b>5</b></li> </ul>	<b>15</b>
<b>Qualifications and Experience of Team Leader</b>	<p>A Team Leader with minimum NQF Level 8 or higher qualification in one or more of the following: Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent. Attach certified qualifications and detailed CV.</p> <p><b>Qualification scoring = 15</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NQF Level 6 or less in one or more of the following: Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent = <b>1</b></li> <li>• NQF Level 7 in one or more of the following: Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent = <b>2</b></li> <li>• NQF Level 8 in one or more of the following:</li> </ul>	<b>30</b>

	<p>Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent = <b>3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NQF Level 9 in one or more of the following: Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent = <b>4</b></li> <li>• NQF Level 10 in one or more of the following: Economics, Finance, Business, Statistics, Quantity Surveying, Auditing, Commercial Law or relevant equivalent = <b>5</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Experience scoring = 15</b></p> <p>A Team Leader with at least 5 years' relevant experience in conducting market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments. Attach a detailed CV with start and end dates including contact details of referees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 years or less relevant experience in market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments = <b>1</b></li> <li>• 4 years' relevant experience in market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments = <b>2</b></li> <li>• 5 years' relevant experience in market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments = <b>3</b></li> <li>• 6 years' relevant experience in market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments = <b>4</b></li> <li>• 7 years' or more relevant experience in market research, price benchmarking, value-for-money analysis, procurement advisory or commercial pricing assessments in public or regulated environments = <b>5</b></li> </ul>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS FOR FUNCTIONALITY</b>		<b>100</b>

**Stage 1: Phase two - Administrative Compliance**

**The bidder to submit the following:**

- Valid Tax Compliance Status Pin (SARS).
- Proof of registration with Central Supplier Database (CSD)

- Fully completed and signed Standard Bidding Documents (SBD's).

**NB: Failure to submit the above-required documentation may result in your proposal being disqualified.**

**Stage 2: Phase One - Price and Specific Goals**

This bid will be evaluated in terms of 80/20 preference point system.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA ON PRICE AND SPECIFIC GOALS**

Price and Specific Goals	100
Price	80
Specific Goals	20

**Price**

$$P_s = 80 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right)$$

Where

Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration Pt = Price of tender under consideration

Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

Preference points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the specific goals in accordance with the table below:

<b>Specific Goals</b>	<b>Number of points (80/20)</b>
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor with at least 51% black women ownership	20
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 4 contributor with at least 51% women ownership	18
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor with at least 51% black youth or disabled ownership	16
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor	14
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 8 contributor with at least 51% youth or disabled ownership	12
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 4 contributor	8
B-BBEE Status Level 5 - 8 contributor	4
Others (Non-Compliant)	0

**Note: In the event of a bidder claiming more than one specific goal category, SASSA will allocate points based on specific goal with the highest points.**

## **10. RFQ CONDITIONS**

- SASSA reserves the right not to accept the lowest quotations, as other aspects such as preference points will be considered.
- SASSA reserves the right to negotiate price with the successful bidder.
- Late quotations will not be accepted.
- Bidders must quote according to the specifications, failure to do so will result in disqualification.

## STANDARD BIDDING DOCUMENT (SBD) 4

### BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE

#### 1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

- 1.1** Any person (natural or juristic) may make an offer or offers in terms of this invitation to bid. In line with the principles of transparency, accountability, impartiality, and ethics as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and further expressed in various pieces of legislation, it is required for the bidder to make this declaration in respect of the details required hereunder.
- 1.2** Where a person/s are listed in the Register for Tender Defaulters and / or the List of Restricted Suppliers, that person will automatically be disqualified from the bid process.

#### 2. BIDDER'S DECLARATION

- 2.1** Is the bidder, or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest<sup>1</sup> in the enterprise, employed by the state? **YES / NO**
- 2.1.1** If so, furnish particulars of the names, individual identity numbers, and, if applicable, state employee numbers of sole proprietor/ directors / trustees / shareholders / members/ partners or any person having a controlling interest in the enterprise, in table below.

---

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



**STANDARD BIDDING DOCUMENT (SBD) 4**

**2.2** Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have a relationship with any person who is employed by the procuring institution? **YES/NO**

**2.2.1** If so, furnish particulars:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

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

**2.3.1** If so, furnish particulars:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**3. DECLARATION**

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

- 3.1 I have read and I understand the contents of this disclosure;
- 3.2 I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this disclosure is found not to be true and complete in every respect;

## STANDARD BIDDING DOCUMENT (SBD) 4

- 3.3 The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor. However, communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium<sup>2</sup> will not be construed as collusive bidding.
- 3.4 In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications, prices, including methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices, market allocation, the intention or decision to submit or not to submit the bid, bidding with the intention not to win the bid and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
- 3.5 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.
- 3.6 There have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements made by the bidder with any official of the procuring institution in relation to this procurement process prior to and during the bidding process except to provide clarification on the bid submitted where so required by the institution; and the bidder was not involved in the drafting of the specifications or terms of reference for this bid.
- 3.7 I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms of

---

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

**STANDARD BIDDING DOCUMENT (SBD) 4**

section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

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

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

.....

Signature

Date

.....

Position

Name of bidder

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

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

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

### 1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

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

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

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

*(delete whichever is not applicable for this tender).*

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

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

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

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

The maximum points for this tender are allocated as follows:

	POINTS
<b>PRICE</b>	
<b>SPECIFIC GOALS</b>	
<b>Total points for Price and SPECIFIC GOALS</b>	<b>100</b>

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

## 2. DEFINITIONS

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

## 3. FORMULAE FOR PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

### 3.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

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

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

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

Where

P<sub>s</sub> = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

P<sub>t</sub> = Price of tender under consideration

P<sub>min</sub> = Price of lowest acceptable tender

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

#### 3.2.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

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

$$Ps = 80 \left( 1 + \frac{Pt - Pmax}{Pmax} \right) \text{ or } Ps = 90 \left( 1 + \frac{Pt - Pmax}{Pmax} \right)$$

Where

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

### 4. POINTS AWARDED FOR SPECIFIC GOALS

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

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

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

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

The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	Number of points allocated (90/10 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points allocated (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points claimed (90/10 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor with at least 51% black women ownership	10	20		
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 4 contributor with at least 51% women ownership	9	18		
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor with at least 51% black youth or disabled ownership	8	16		
B-BBEE Status Level 1 - 2 contributor	7	14		
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 8 contributor with at least 51% youth or disabled ownership	5	12		
B-BBEE Status Level 3 - 4 contributor	3	8		
B-BBEE Status Level 5 - 8 contributor	2	4		
OTHERS	0	0		
Note: In the event of a bidder claiming more than one specific goal category, the Agency will allocate points based on specific goal with the highest points. The highest points will be confirmed with the BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit submitted by bidder/CIPC etc.				

**DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM**

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

4.4. Company registration number: .....

4.5. TYPE OF COMPANY/ FIRM

Partnership/Joint Venture / Consortium

- One-person business/sole propriety
  - Close corporation
  - Public Company
  - Personal Liability Company
  - (Pty) Limited
  - Non-Profit Company
  - State Owned Company
- [TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

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

- i) The information furnished is true and correct;
- ii) The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form;
- iii) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraphs 1.4 and 4.2, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the organ of state that the claims are correct;
- iv) If the specific goals have been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the organ of state may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –
  - (a) disqualify the person from the tendering process;
  - (b) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person’s conduct;
  - (c) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;
  - (d) recommend that the tenderer or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, be restricted from obtaining business from any organ of state for a period not exceeding 10 years, after the *audi alteram partem* (hear the other side) rule has been applied; and
  - (e) forward the matter for criminal prosecution, if deemed necessary.

<p>.....</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE(S) OF TENDERER(S)</b></p>
<p><b>SURNAME AND NAME:</b> .....</p>
<p><b>DATE:</b> .....</p>
<p><b>ADDRESS:</b> .....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>