



OFFICE OF THE PREMIER: NORTHERN CAPE

Request for proposal for the appointment of a service provider from the panel of Risk Managers for the Northern Cape Provincial Government for a period of 30 months.

Duration: 30 months

Date Issued: 17 June 2025

Closing date and time: 26 June 2025 at 11h00

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

TENDER BOX ADDRESS:

Office of the Premier
t & i building
69 Memorial Road
Monument Heights
Kimberley

Delivered to:
Room number: 14
First Floor
Block B

1. Purpose

- 1.1. The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to invite submissions from service providers listed on the Panel of Health Risk Managers to deliver consultancy services in accordance with the Policy and Procedure on Incapacity Leave and Ill-health Retirement (PILIR). These services are required for departments within the Northern Cape Provincial Administration/Cluster. The objective of this RFP is to identify the most suitable service provider to support the Implementation Area in managing incapacity leave applications and ill-health retirement assessments efficiently and within prescribed timeframes.

2. Background

- 2.1. The lawfulness of the Eastern Cape Provincial Administration's 2022 selection of a Health Risk Manager was challenged in the Eastern Cape High Court. The Court ruled that the secondary selection process—conducted through interviews to appoint a service provider from the Panel—was flawed and did not comply with the requirements of Section 217 of the Constitution.
- 2.2. In response to the judgment, the modality for implementing the Policy and Procedure on Incapacity Leave and Ill-Health Retirement (PILIR) was amended, specifically in relation to the selection of service providers by implementation areas. The amended Framework for Decentralisation now provides for the issuing of a Request for Proposal (RFP), which will be evaluated based on defined criteria.
- 2.3. This approach ensures a fair and transparent appointment process for health risk management services, in line with the principles of openness, competitiveness, and value for money.
- 2.4. The ruling reaffirmed that departments must engage service providers from the approved Panel of Health Risk Managers through a structured evaluation process that balances alignment with operational needs and fairness in selection.

3. Proposal Requirements

- 3.1. Service providers must submit a detailed and comprehensive proposal, clearly addressing the following components to demonstrate their ability to meet the requirements of the implementation area:

3.1.1. Service Delivery Approach

- 3.1.1.1. Provide a detailed outline of the specific approach to be employed to address the implementation area's needs.
- 3.1.1.2. Highlight the steps, processes, and methodologies to ensure efficient and effective service delivery.
- 3.1.1.3. Clearly articulate the tools and technologies that will be utilized to streamline service delivery and achieve objectives.
- 3.1.1.4. Include a proposed timeline with key milestones, deliverables, and checkpoints to track progress and ensure accountability.

3.1.2. Capacity and Resources

- 3.1.2.1. Demonstrate the availability and adequacy of key resources, including personnel, technology, and infrastructure, to manage the anticipated workload effectively.
- 3.1.2.2. Provide a detailed overview of the qualifications, skills, and experience of key staff members who will be involved in service delivery.
- 3.1.2.3. Include information on operational systems, communication protocols, and support mechanisms to ensure uninterrupted service delivery.
- 3.1.2.4. Highlight the organization's ability to scale operations to handle increases in service demand, including any contingency measures to address unexpected surges in workload.

3.1.3. Experience and Expertise

- 3.1.3.1. Present a track record of successfully delivering services in similar environments or to clients with comparable needs.
- 3.1.3.2. Provide at least three detailed case studies or examples of past projects, showcasing achievements and the relevance of the work to the implementation area's requirements.

3.1.3.3. Highlight any niche expertise, innovative practices, or unique methodologies that set the provider apart from competitors and align with the implementation area's needs.

3.1.3.4. Include testimonials, references, or endorsements from previous clients to support claims of expertise and effectiveness.

3.1.4. Quality Assurance

3.1.4.1. Outline the mechanisms and processes in place to ensure the delivery of high-quality services.

3.1.4.2. Specify key performance indicators (KPIs) that will be used to measure success and track performance throughout the engagement.

3.1.4.3. Provide details of quality control measures, including regular evaluations, monitoring processes, and reporting frameworks to ensure adherence to service level agreements (SLAs).

3.1.4.4. Highlight any accreditation, certifications, or standards adhered to by the provider that demonstrate a commitment to quality.

3.1.5. Risk Management

3.1.5.1. Identify potential risks that could arise during service delivery and impact the implementation area.

3.1.5.2. Provide a detailed risk management plan that includes strategies for mitigating identified risks and minimizing disruptions.

3.1.5.3. Demonstrate the ability to proactively address unforeseen challenges to ensure uninterrupted service delivery.

3.1.5.4. Highlight any previous experience in managing risks in similar projects and provide examples of successful risk mitigation strategies.

3.1.6. Value for Money

3.1.6.1. Clearly articulate how the proposed services deliver value beyond cost, emphasizing expertise, service quality, and measurable outcomes.

- 3.1.6.2. Provide a rationale for how the approach, capacity, and proposed solutions align with achieving the best possible outcomes for the implementation area.
 - 3.1.6.3. Highlight any cost-effective strategies, innovative practices, or efficiencies that demonstrate a commitment to optimizing resources and achieving value for money.
 - 3.1.6.4. Detail any added value the provider can offer, such as additional services, innovative tools, or long-term benefits to the implementation area.
- 3.2. Service providers are encouraged to provide detailed, evidence-based responses for each component to ensure a thorough evaluation of their proposal. Proposals should also reflect an understanding of the implementation area's unique needs and demonstrate how the provider's approach aligns with achieving the desired objectives.

4. Evaluation Process:

- 4.1. The Bid proposals shall be evaluated individually on score sheets by the Selection Committee according to the evaluation criteria indicated in the Request for Proposals. The total score for each proposal will be calculated based on the weighted criteria. Following the scoring process, results will be compiled to rank the providers. The provider with the highest score will be selected.
- 4.2. In the event that two (or more) service providers achieve the same total score during the evaluation of proposals, the following tie-breaker procedure shall be applied to determine the most suitable provider for appointment.
- 4.3. Each tied proposal shall be re-evaluated based on the following three components only:
 - 4.3.1. Quality assurance;
 - 4.3.2. Risk Management; and
 - 4.3.3. Value for Money
- 4.4. The provider with the higher aggregate score across these components will be selected.
- 4.5. If the tie persists after the re-evaluation, a formal ball draw shall be conducted to determine the appointed provider.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

4.6. Ball Draw Procedure

4.6.1. The Chairperson shall explain the purpose and detailed steps of the ball draw to all present.

4.6.2. Each tied service provider will be assigned a number, based on alphabetical order.

4.6.3. Numbered balls, corresponding to the tied providers, will be shown to all attendees to confirm that they are identical and only represent the tied parties.

4.6.4. The numbered balls will then be placed into a transparent container.

4.7. Draw Execution:

4.7.1. The Chairperson shall request nominations from the Selection Committee for a member to conduct the draw.

4.7.2. If multiple nominations are received, the nominated names shall be placed into a container. The nominees will temporarily leave the room.

4.7.3. The Chairperson shall draw one name from the container to determine who will conduct the ball draw.

4.7.4. The selected committee member shall draw one ball from the container.

4.7.5. The Chairperson will announce the number drawn and confirm the corresponding service provider. That provider shall be appointed.

5. Selection Criteria

5.1. The evaluation of proposals will be based on the proposal requirements. Each proposal will be assessed using a five-point scoring system (1–5). Scores are weighted to reflect the importance of each criterion in meeting the implementation area's needs.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1–5)	Weight (%)
Service Delivery Approach	The service provider a) Provided a detailed outline of the specific approach it will employ to address the implementation	a) The proposal lacks a clear and detailed outline of the service delivery approach. Key steps, processes, methodologies, tools, technologies, and timelines are either missing or vaguely mentioned. No		20%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1–5)	Weight (%)
	area's health risk management needs. b) Highlighted the steps, processes, and methodologies it will employ to ensure efficient and effective service delivery. c) articulated the tools and technologies that will be utilized to streamline service delivery and achieve objectives. d) Included a proposed timeline with key milestones, deliverables, and checkpoints to track progress and ensure accountability.	structured plan is provided. (1 Point) b) The proposal provides a basic outline of the service delivery approach, but it lacks sufficient detail. Some steps, processes, and tools are mentioned, but they are not well-articulated. The timeline is incomplete or lacks key milestones. (2 Points) c) The proposal presents a justifiable service delivery approach with moderate detail. Steps, processes, and methodologies are outlined, but some areas require further clarity. The timeline includes milestones but may not fully ensure accountability. (3 Points) d) The proposal provides a well-structured and detailed service delivery approach. All key elements, including steps, processes, methodologies, tools, and technologies, are clearly outlined. The timeline is well-developed with clear milestones, deliverables, and checkpoints. (4 Points) e) The proposal demonstrates a comprehensive and highly detailed service delivery approach. Steps, processes, methodologies, and tools are innovative and well-integrated. The timeline is precise, realistic, and includes strong accountability measures. (5 Points)		
Capacity and Resources	The service provider – a) demonstrated the availability and adequacy of key	a. The proposal lacks sufficient information on key resources. Personnel, technology, and infrastructure are either not		20%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1-5)	Weight (%)
	resources, including personnel, technology, and infrastructure, to manage the anticipated workload effectively. b) Provide a detailed overview of the qualifications, skills, and experience of key staff members who will be involved in service delivery. c) Included information on operational systems, communication protocols, and support mechanisms to ensure uninterrupted service delivery. d) Highlighted the organization's ability to scale operations to handle increases in service demand, including any contingency measures to address unexpected surges in workload. e) Evidence of qualified staff, technology, operational systems, and scalability plans.	addressed or inadequately described. No details are provided on staff qualifications, operational systems, communication protocols, or scalability measures. (1 Point) b. The proposal provides a basic description of key resources but lacks detail. Some mention of personnel, technology, and infrastructure is made, but the information is vague. Staff qualifications and experience are not well-defined. Limited or no mention of operational systems, communication protocols, or scalability. (2 Points) c. The proposal presents a justifiable level of detail on key resources. Personnel, technology, and infrastructure are covered, but some areas lack depth. Staff qualifications and operational systems are described but may need more clarity. Scalability and contingency measures are mentioned but not fully developed. (3 Points) d. The proposal provides a well-structured and detailed response. All key resources, including personnel, technology, and infrastructure, are clearly described. Staff qualifications, experience, and operational systems are well outlined. Scalability and contingency measures are explained effectively. (4 Points) e. The proposal presents a comprehensive and highly detailed plan. Key resources are fully demonstrated, with strong evidence of personnel expertise, technological capability, and infrastructure readiness. Staff		

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1–5)	Weight (%)
		qualifications and experience are clearly aligned with service needs. Operational systems and communication protocols are robust. Scalability and contingency measures are well-defined and proactive. (5 Points)		
Experience and Expertise	The service provider – a) demonstrated a track record of successfully delivering services in similar environments or to clients with comparable needs. b) Provided at least three detailed case studies or examples of past projects, showcasing achievements and the relevance of the work to the implementation area's requirements. c) Highlighted any niche expertise, innovative practices, or unique methodologies that set the provider apart from competitors and align with the implementation area's needs. d) Included testimonials, references, or endorsements from previous clients to	a. The proposal provides little to no evidence of past experience. No case studies, references, or testimonials are included. No demonstration of expertise, innovative practices, or unique methodologies. (1 Point) b. The proposal includes some information on past experience, but it lacks detail or relevance. Fewer than three case studies/examples are provided, or they are vague. Limited mention of niche expertise or innovative practices. Minimal or absent client references /testimonials. (2 Points) c. The proposal presents a reasonable level of experience with at least three relevant case studies. Some mention of expertise, innovative practices, or unique methodologies, but not in-depth. Includes some client references/testimonials, but they are not strong or comprehensive. (3 Points) d. The proposal provides a well-structured response with strong evidence of past experience. Three or more case studies showcase relevant projects and achievements. Demonstrates niche expertise and innovative practices that align with		20%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1-5)	Weight (%)
	support claims of expertise and effectiveness. e) Case studies, success stories, client testimonials, and niche expertise aligned to the implementation area.	requirements. Client testimonials/references are included and provide solid support. (4 Points) e. The proposal presents a highly detailed and compelling track record. Case studies are highly relevant, well-documented, and clearly demonstrate expertise. Strong evidence of niche expertise, innovative practices, and unique methodologies. Multiple client testimonials/references provide strong validation of effectiveness and service quality. (5 Points)		
Quality Assurance	The service provider – a) Outlined the mechanisms and processes in place to ensure the delivery of high-quality services. b) Specified the key performance indicators (KPIs) that will be used to measure success and track performance throughout the engagement. c) Provided details of quality control measures, including regular evaluations, monitoring processes, and reporting frameworks to ensure adherence to service level agreements (SLAs).	a. The proposal provides little to no evidence of quality assurance mechanisms. No clear KPIs, quality control measures, or adherence to standards. No mention of accreditations or certifications. (1 Point) b. The proposal references quality assurance measures but lacks detail. KPIs and quality control measures are vaguely described. Limited or unclear processes for monitoring and evaluation. Minimal or no accreditations/certifications provided. (2 Points) c. The proposal presents a justifiable quality assurance framework with defined KPIs and limited monitoring processes. Provides basic quality control measures and reporting frameworks. Limited reference of industry standards, accreditations, or certifications. (3 Points) d. The proposal includes a well-structured quality assurance plan with clear KPIs, regular monitoring, and detailed reporting processes.		15%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1-5)	Weight (%)
	d) Highlighted any accreditation, certifications, or standards adhered to by the provider that demonstrate a commitment to quality. e) Processes for monitoring quality, adherence to SLAs, KPIs, and reporting frameworks.	Clear and comprehensive demonstration of compliance with SLAs. Accreditations and certifications are provided and relevant to the service. (4 Points) e. The proposal presents a comprehensive and highly detailed quality assurance plan. KPIs are well-defined, with clear monitoring, evaluation, and reporting mechanisms. Demonstrates a strong commitment to quality through recognized accreditations, certifications, and industry standards. Quality control measures are robust and well-documented. (5 Points)		
Risk Management	The service provider – a) Identified potential risks that could arise during service delivery and impact the implementation area. b) Provided a detailed risk management plan that includes strategies for mitigating identified risks and minimizing disruptions. c) Demonstrated the ability to proactively address unforeseen challenges to ensure uninterrupted service delivery. d) Highlighted any previous experience in managing risks in similar projects and	a. The proposal does not identify potential risks or provide a risk management plan. No evidence of past experience in risk mitigation. No proactive strategies for handling unforeseen challenges. (1 Point) b. The proposal mentions potential risks but lacks a structured risk management plan. Risk mitigation strategies are vague or insufficient. Limited evidence of past experience in managing risks. Limited demonstration of proactive measures. (2 Points) c. The proposal includes a risk management plan with basic risk identification and mitigation strategies. Limited past experience in risk management is provided, though examples is limited or lack detail. Justifiable demonstration of proactive risk handling. (3 Points)		15%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1-5)	Weight (%)
	provide examples of successful risk mitigation strategies. e) Detailed risk management plan, including identified risks and mitigation strategies.	d. The proposal presents a well-structured risk management plan, clearly identifying risks and providing solid mitigation strategies. Demonstrates experience in managing risks through relevant examples. Shows a proactive approach to handling unforeseen challenges. (4 Points) e. The proposal provides a highly detailed risk management plan, thoroughly identifying risks and presenting robust mitigation strategies. Demonstrates extensive experience in managing risks with well-documented case studies. Clearly outlines proactive measures to prevent disruptions and ensure continuous service delivery. (5 Points)		
Value for Money	The service provider – a) Clearly articulated how the proposed services will deliver value beyond cost, emphasizing expertise, service quality, and measurable outcomes. b) Provided a rationale for how the approach, capacity, and proposed solutions align with achieving the best possible outcomes for the implementation area. c) Highlighted any cost-effective strategies, innovative	a) The proposal does not indicate how the services provide value beyond cost. No clear rationale for alignment with desired outcomes. No mention of cost-effective strategies, innovation, or additional value. (1 Point) b) The proposal provides a limited explanation of value beyond cost. Some attempt is made to align the approach with implementation area outcomes, but details are vague. Few cost-effective strategies or innovative practices are mentioned. Minimal added value is proposed. (2 Points) c) The proposal highlights value that extends beyond mere cost, providing a logical rationale for achieving desired outcomes. Some cost-effective strategies and efficiencies are included, but		10%

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Appointment of a service provider from the panel of Health Risk Managers.

Functional Factors	Proof Required	Scoring Indicators	Score (1-5)	Weight (%)
	practices, or efficiencies that demonstrate a commitment to optimizing resources and achieving value for money. d) Detailed any added value the provider can offer, such as additional services, innovative tools, or long-term benefits to the implementation area. e) Explanation of cost-effectiveness, added value, and alignment with outcomes.	details are not comprehensive. Some added value is presented but lacks strong differentiation. (3 Points) d) The proposal provides a well-structured explanation of value beyond cost, with strong reasoning for how the approach aligns with achieving the best outcomes. Demonstrates cost-effective strategies, efficiencies, and some innovation. Clearly identifies added value through additional services or tools. (4 Points) e) The proposal presents a thorough and compelling case for value beyond cost, strongly emphasizing expertise, service quality, and measurable outcomes. Clearly demonstrates innovative and cost-effective strategies that optimize resources. Provides substantial added value with long-term benefits, unique solutions, or differentiated services. (5 Points)-		

6. Scoring Scale Explanation:

Score	Description
1	Proposal is incomplete, vague, or fails to meet basic requirements.
2	Proposal addresses some requirements but has significant gaps in alignment, detail, or evidence.
3	Proposal meets the basic requirements with sufficient alignment to the implementation area's needs.
4	Proposal is well-aligned, with strong evidence and minor gaps in detail or customization.
5	Proposal exceeds expectations, is fully customized to the implementation area's needs, and provides strong evidence of expertise, innovation, and value.

7. Submission of Proposals

- 7.1. Service providers must submit a complete response to this RFP to the Office of the Premier: Northern Cape **by not later than 26 June 2025 @ 11h00.**
- 7.2. Submission Format:
- 7.2.1. Proposals must be provided in hard copy with Numbered Sections. Proposals must be neatly bound with clearly numbered tabs that correspond to the evaluation criteria. One (1) original and 11 duplicate copies must be submitted.
- 7.2.2. Proposal may either be posted to Office of the Premier, t & i building, 69 Memorial Road, Monument Heights, Kimberley, room 14, First floor, Block B (preferably registered mail) OR placed in the tender box OR couriered to the aforesaid address on or before the closing date and time
- 7.3. Contact Information: Queries and clarifications should be reduced to writing directed to P Meruti at tenders_otp@ncpg.gov.za
- 7.4. Proposals received late will not be considered.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1. This RFP outlines the requirements and criteria for selecting a suitable service provider from the Panel of HRMs. Service providers are encouraged to submit comprehensive proposals that demonstrate their capability to deliver high-quality health risk management services in line with PILIR.