



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

RFP NUMBER	RFQ CO 439/09/2026
DATE ISSUED	22 September 2026
PROJECT NAME	Quantitative Risk Analysis Solution
CLOSING DATE AND TIME	09 October 2026 @ 16:00
NAME OF PROPOSER/TENDERER	
CSD SUPPLIER NUMBER (MA NUMBER)	
TELEPHONE NUMBER	
FAX NUMBER	
EMAIL ADDRESS	
PHYSICAL ADDRESS	
B-BBEE STATUS LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION	
FULL NAME OF BIDDER OR HIS OR HER REPRESENTATIVE	
IDENTITY NUMBER	
POSITION OCCUPIED IN THE COMPANY (DIRECTOR, TRUSTEE, SHAREHOLDER)	
COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER	
TAX REFERENCE NUMBER	
VAT REGISTRATION NUMBER	
QUOTE PRICE (INCL VAT)	
SIGNATURE	

Full details of directors / trustees / members / shareholders.

Full Name	Identity Number	Personal Tax Reference Number	State Employee Number / Persal Number

A. BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE (SBD 4)

1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

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.

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 interest¹ 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.

¹ 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.



Full Name	Identity Number	Name of State institution

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. SBD 4 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;

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 consortium² will not be construed as collusive bidding.

² 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.



- 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 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

B. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE QUANTITATIVE RISK ANALYSIS SOLUTION

1. BACKGROUND TO SANSA

The South African National Space Agency (SANSA) has a mandate, as outlined in the South African National Space Agency Act, 2008 (Act No 36 of 2008), to co-ordinate and integrate national space science and technology programmes and conduct long-term planning and implementation of space-related activities in South Africa, for the benefit of the citizens of South Africa

2. SCOPE OF WORK (TERMS OF REFERENCE)

SANSA is seeking a quantitative risk analysis and decision-support solution for a period of three(3) years to support the identification, modelling, quantification, analysis, and communication of uncertainty and risk across financial, programme, project, strategic, and operational activities. The proposed solution must be a desktop-based application and fully compatible with the latest version (as well as backward compatible) of Microsoft Windows operating systems, including installation, operation, and support within the Agency's Microsoft Windows environment. Furthermore, the proposed solution should work with Microsoft excel and/ or Microsoft Project.

Bidders must ensure that all submitted proposals and supporting documentation are their own work and accurately reflect the proposed solution's capabilities. Proposals containing undisclosed AI-generated content, or content that the bidder cannot substantiate or demonstrate, will be disqualified. Furthermore, proposals generated using AI will be disqualified.

Sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation must be submitted, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration; it will serve as supporting evidence for the applicable evaluation criteria. Bidders must ensure that the evidence clearly demonstrates the functionality and capabilities claimed in their proposal.

Bidders are encouraged to submit a separate proposal addressing the scope of work and the evaluation criteria.

Where the proposed solution is provided by a third-party software manufacturer, the bidder must submit a valid OEM authorisation or distributor appointment letter confirming that the bidder is duly authorised to market, supply, license, implement, and support the proposed solution.

The Agency currently undertakes planning and risk management in an environment characterised by uncertainty and multiple variables. Traditional deterministic models provide useful baseline estimates but generally represent uncertain variables as single-point assumptions, thereby offering limited insight into the probabilities and ranges of possible outcomes.

The solution must enable SANSA to move from single-point forecasts to probability-based analysis, allowing decision-makers to see not only the expected outcome but also the

range and likelihood of alternative outcomes. The solution must already exist; there is no provision for development.

The solution must therefore support quantitative and probabilistic risk analysis, Monte Carlo simulation, scenario analysis, stress testing, sensitivity analysis, and decision analysis. Furthermore, the successful bidder shall provide an easily transferable single-user license, complete quantitative risk analysis solution, including licensing, implementation, training, technical support, and associated support for a period of three(3) years.

The solution must complement existing enterprise risk management and enable the Agency to carry out:

- Probabilistic Risk Analysis: The solution must provide functionality for representing uncertainty using probability distributions rather than relying solely on deterministic values.
- Monte Carlo Simulation: The solution must provide Monte Carlo simulation functionality capable of repeatedly evaluating a model using sampled values from defined probability distributions.
- Financial and Budgetary Risk Analysis: The solution must support quantitative analysis of financial sustainability and budgetary risk.
- Programme and Project Risk Analysis: The solution must support quantitative analysis of programmes and projects.
- Correlation and Dependency Modelling: The solution must support modelling dependencies and correlations between uncertain variables.
- Sensitivity Analysis: the solution must provide sensitivity analysis to identify the variables that most strongly influence selected outputs.
- Scenario Analysis: The solution must support scenario planning.
- Stress Testing: the solution must support structured stress testing for financial, programme and enterprise risk models.
- Decision Tree and Decision Analysis: The solution must provide decision-tree functionality to support structured analysis of alternative decisions under uncertainty.
- Risk Treatment Analysis: The solution must enable users to model the effects of risk treatments and controls.
- Statistical and Historical Data Analysis: The solution should allow historical data to be used to develop quantitative models.
- Excel and Existing Model Integration: The solution must support integration with spreadsheet-based financial and planning models.
- Reporting and Visualisation: The solution must provide clear, decision-useful reporting.
- Security and Information Protection: The solution will process confidential financial information, strategic plans, project information, risk information, and other sensitive organisational data. The proposed solution must therefore ensure that unauthorised persons, including the software/solution provider, third parties, or external users, cannot access organisational information.
- Cybersecurity Requirements: The bidder must provide evidence of the security controls implemented within the proposed solution.
- Training: The successful bidder shall provide training for relevant personnel, including the necessary support for using the solution.

C. EVALUATION CRITERIA

SANSA promotes the concept of “best value” in the award of contracts, as opposed to merely looking for the cheapest price, which does not necessarily provide the best value. Best value incorporates the expertise, experience and technical proposal of the organisation and individuals who will be providing the service and the organisational capacity supporting the project team.

SANSA is committed to achieving Government's transformation objectives in terms of the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act.

The value of this bid is estimated not to exceed R1 million (all applicable taxes included) and therefore the **80/20** system shall be applicable.

Please Note: the above amount (R1 million) is not the budgeted amount for this project, but it is the Treasury threshold for written price quotations.

The procedure for the evaluation of responsive tenders is **price, functionality (quality) and preference** method. The evaluation of the bids will be conducted in the following two stages:

- Firstly, the assessment of quality will be done in terms of the evaluation criteria (Table 3) and the minimum threshold of 80 points explained below. A bid will be disqualified if it fails to meet the minimum threshold for functionality as per the bid invitation.
- Thereafter, only the qualifying bids are evaluated in terms of the 80/20 preference points systems, where the 80 points will be used for price and the 20 points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the specific goals in accordance with the Table below.

1. Preference

Specific goals for this RFP and number of points are indicated as per table 1 below. Proof of the specific goals below must be attached and submitted with the bid document in order to qualify for the preference points (specific goals).

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

Table 1: Specific Goals and points

Equity Ownership	Proof of evidence	Percentage owned ³	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)
51% black owned	• CSD Report, • CIPC registration, • I D Copies,		10	

³ This percentage owned refers to percentage of ownership by persons who are actively involved in and exercise control over the enterprise / company (the bidder)



	• Share certificates/ register (if applicable) • BBBEE certificate/ BBBEE sworn affidavit			
40% black women owned	• CSD Report, • CIPC registration, • I D Copies, • Share certificates/ register (if applicable) • BBBEE certificate/ BBBEE sworn affidavit		6	
51% owned by Black Designated Groups			4	
Total Points (Specific Goals)			20	

Table 2: Details of equity ownership as per table 1

Equity Ownership	Name of Persons	Type of actively involved in or type of control over enterprise/company
51% black owned		
40% black women owned		
51% owned by Black Designated Groups		

Table 3: Checklist for specific goals proof of evidence as per table 1

Note: All proof of evidence must be submitted by the bidder to get points. Failure to submit all applicable proof of evidence documents will result in zero points.

Equity Ownership	Proof of evidence	Document submitted (Yes/No)
51% black owned	CSD Report	
	CIPC registration	
	I D Copies	
	Share certificates/ register (if applicable)	
	BBBEE certificate/ BBBEE sworn affidavit	
40% black women owned	CSD Report	
	CIPC registration	
	I D Copies	
	Share certificates/ register (if applicable)	
	BBBEE certificate/ BBBEE sworn affidavit	
51% owned by Black Designated Groups		

2. Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for the functionality, price and preferencing evaluation, the bidder must submit the following as per table 2 below.

If there is **"No"** on the Table 2 below, the bidder who didn't submit the required document (s) with their bid will be requested in writing to submit them within three (3) working days for inclusion in the Bid Evaluation Committee item, if a bidder fails to submit on the 3rd working day, the relevant bid will be rejected.

Table 4: Eligibility Criteria

Criteria	Attached (Yes/No)	Comments
Third-Party Software Authorization Requirements. Where the proposed solution is provided by a third-party software developer or		

original equipment manufacturer (OEM), the bidder must submit a valid OEM Authorization or Distributor Appointment Letter. This document must explicitly confirm that the bidder is duly authorized to market, supply, license, implement, and support the proposed solution.		
---	--	--

3. Quality/Functionality:

Scores will be tabulated to 100 points. Respondents must score **80 points** and over to be assessed on their financial offer (Price) and preference (specific goals) score.

The allocation of points for the evaluation of quality/functionality is set out in Table 3 below:

Table 5: Quality/Functionality Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Points
Quantitative Risk Analysis and Modelling	40
Decision Support, Decision Tree and Strategic Analysis	20
Technical, Security and Information Protection	40
Total evaluation points for quality	100

Criterion 1- Quantitative Risk Analysis and Modelling (40 Points)

This criterion assesses the bidder's ability to provide a comprehensive quantitative risk analysis capability that enables the SANSA to model uncertainty, quantify risk, and assess the probability and range of potential outcomes. The proposed solution should move beyond deterministic forecasting by representing uncertain variables probabilistically and analysing them through simulation and statistical techniques.

Evaluation will focus on the solution's ability to perform probabilistic risk analysis, Monte Carlo simulation, probability distribution modelling, correlation and dependency analysis, financial and programme risk modelling, sensitivity analysis, scenario and stress testing, statistical analysis, model validation, and quantitative reporting. The highest scores should be awarded to solutions that demonstrate mature, flexible and integrated quantitative risk



science, technology
& innovation

Department:
Science, Technology and Innovation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



SCM-F-04 - RFP

modelling capabilities that can be applied to complex organisational, financial, programme and project risks.

NB! Failure to submit evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, will result in a zero score.

0 – Not met	1 – Partially met	2 – Fully meets requirement	3 – Exceeds requirement
Score 0	Score 20	Score 30	Score 40
- No probabilistic analysis capability - Cannot represent uncertain variables with distributions - No Monte Carlo capability. - No ability to model correlations/dependencies - No sensitivity analysis - No scenario/stress capability - No meaningful quantitative reporting.	- Limited probabilistic functionality; significant restrictions or workarounds required. - Simulation is significantly constrained in iterations, complexity, reproducibility or analysis. - Limited distribution library or substantial manual work. - Basic sensitivity analysis with limited outputs or variables. - Limited descriptive statistics. - Basic charts/reports with limited analytical value.	- Robust probabilistic analysis using defined probability distributions. - Reliable Monte Carlo simulation with configurable iterations and appropriate sampling. - Supports appropriate continuous and discrete distributions and user-defined parameters. - Supports correlation between uncertain variables and appropriate dependency modelling. - Defines, compares and analyses scenarios and stress cases. - Clear distributions, histograms, percentiles and quantitative reports.	- Advanced probabilistic analysis with extensive distributions, modelling flexibility and robust analytical capabilities. - Highly scalable simulation with advanced sampling, convergence analysis, reproducibility and diagnostics. - Extensive distributions, empirical distributions, distribution fitting and advanced uncertainty modelling. - Comprehensive tornado, correlation, ranking and advanced sensitivity analyses with clear identification of business variables. - Complex multi-variable scenarios, severe-but-plausible stress tests and automated comparison. - Highly configurable management-ready dashboards, reports and visualisation. - Advanced statistical analysis, distribution fitting and empirical modelling.

The service provider did not submit sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration.	The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.	The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.	The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.
---	--	--	--

Criterion 2 - Decision Support, Decision Trees and Strategic Analysis (20 Points)

This criterion assesses how effectively the proposed solution translates quantitative risk analysis into practical decision-support information for management and governance structures. The solution should enable SANSA to evaluate alternative courses of action under uncertainty and to understand the potential consequences of different decisions. Evaluation will focus on decision-tree functionality, quantitative decision analysis, risk treatment analysis, scenario planning, stress testing, probability and threshold analysis, and management-level reporting. The highest scores should be awarded to solutions that demonstrate the ability to integrate uncertainty, probabilities, alternative decisions and potential outcomes into clear, actionable decision-support analysis.

0 – Not met Score 0	1 – Partially met Score 5	2 – Fully meets requirement Score 10	3 – Exceeds requirement Score 20
- No decision-tree capability. - No quantitative decision-analysis capability. - Cannot evaluate risk treatments quantitatively.	- Basic decision trees with significant restrictions. - Limited comparison of alternatives - Basic before/after comparison. - Limited threshold analysis. - Limited scenario functionality - Outputs require substantial manual interpretation/reconstruction.	- Supports decisions, probabilities and outcomes. - Quantitative comparison of alternative decisions under uncertainty. - Quantifies impact of risk treatments and controls.	- Detailed comparison of alternative treatments, costs, benefits and residual risk. - Complex multi-variable scenarios, comparison and strategic what-if analysis.

- Cannot determine probabilities against targets. - No scenario capability. - Outputs unsuitable for management decisions. The service provider did not submit sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration.	- Limited to less than 5 variables The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.	- Determines probability of achieving/exceeding targets or thresholds. - Supports base, optimistic, pessimistic and defined scenarios. - Clear outputs suitable for management and governance reporting. - Limited to 6-20 variables The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.	- Complex combined stresses and analysis against risk appetite/tolerance or thresholds. - Advanced probability, percentile, confidence-level and threshold analysis. - Highly effective executive dashboards and automated comparative reporting - Supports multiple variables exceeding The service provider submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating the model or simulation, whether as screenshots, a model file, or a recorded demonstration, demonstrating the above criteria.
---	--	---	---

Criterion 3- Technical, Security and Information Protection (40 Points)

This criterion assesses the proposed solution's technical suitability, security architecture and information-protection capabilities. As the solution may process confidential financial, strategic, programme, project and risk information, SANSA requires assurance that its information will remain under its control and be inaccessible to unauthorised internal or external parties. Evaluation will therefore focus on confidentiality and data protection, control of vendor and third-party access, identity and access management, authentication, encryption, audit logging, security assurance, vulnerability management, deployment architecture, resilience, disaster recovery and data portability. The highest scores should be awarded to solutions that demonstrate strong, independently verifiable security controls and provide SANSA with clear technical and administrative control over its information throughout the solution lifecycle.

0 – Not met Score 0	1 – Partially met Score 10	2 – Fully meets requirement Score 20	3 – Exceeds requirement Score 40
- No adequate assurance that organisational information will be protected. - Third parties can access organisational information without adequate controls. - No meaningful audit logging. - No meaningful security assurance evidence. - Organisation cannot adequately retrieve information/models.	- Basic controls but significant confidentiality/architecture concerns. - The bidder's access controls exist but have significant limitations. - Limited activity logging. - Limited export or significant vendor dependency.	- Appropriate controls prevent unauthorised access to organisational information. - External/bidder's access is controlled, authorised, auditable and restricted. - Appropriate logging of user access and administrative activity. - Practical mechanisms to export organisational data and models.	- Strong defence-in-depth protection with comprehensive controls. - Organisation retains strong control, with highly restricted or technically prevented unauthorised external access and should restrict exporting of organisational data by the vendor. - The solution must not automatically transmit any SANSA data or information to the software vendor, distributor, or any third party, and must not provide any unauthorised backdoor or remote access to the system. - Comprehensive data/model portability and low-dependency exit strategy.

D. PRICING SCHEDULE

Pricing Instructions

1. The Bidder must price all items;
2. Rates are to include all costs with no unspecified costs to allow for a fair evaluation.
3. Payment will be made based on the deliverables (proven progress) for the services rendered/goods received.
4. Payment will only be made on the basis of invoices provided.
5. Offer to be valid for 30 days from the bid closing date.

Note ! Price quotation should be for a singular license.

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT (EXCL VAT)
VAT (15%)	
TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT (INCLUDING VAT)	

E. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

- a) Quotations to be returned to Boitumelo Maredi :bmaredi@sansa.org.za
- b) Contract will not be awarded unless supplier is registered on the Central Supplier Database (CSD). A supplier registration summary with a compliance tax status must be submitted with the proposal. Potential suppliers should contact SANSA should they require assistance in registering on the CSD) before the closing date of the bid.
- c) This RFP is part of the Supplier Development Programme (SDP). The recommended bidder will be required to sign the SDP agreement for shorter payment periods for Black Owned EMEs and QSEs.
- d) The offices of SANSA are situated at the following address:

**Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) Campus
Building 10, Meiring Naudé Road
Brummeria
Pretoria,**

F. TIMELINES

The successful service provider must be in the position to provide the goods/service within 1 week after the purchase order has been issued by SANSA.

G. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND MINIMUM CRITERIA

In order to demonstrate their capacity and score points with respect to the criteria, tenderers should provide the following supporting documentation.

- a. A method statement of how the tenderer proposes to implement the project.
- b. Proof of specific goals must be submitted in order to qualify for preference points (specific goals).
- c. Quotation must reflect a cost breakdown, where applicable, prices quoted must be inclusive of VAT.
- d. All pages of quotation must be signed by the authorised person.
- e. SANSA has the right to withdraw any quotation at any time within the validity of the quotation.
- f. SANSA reserves the right to invite bidders to present their bid proposals for final decision or visit the bidders' premises or contact the references as part of the evaluation process.

H. DECLARATION

The undersigned, who warrants that he / she is duly authorized to do so on behalf of the enterprise:

- I. confirms that neither the name of the enterprise or the name of any partner, manager, director or other person, who wholly or partly exercises, or may exercise, control over the enterprise appears on the Register of Tender Defaulters established in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act of 2004.
- II. confirms that no partner, member, director or other person, who wholly or partly exercises, or may exercise, control over the enterprise appears, has within the last five years been convicted of fraud or corruption.
- III. confirms that I / we are not associated, linked or involved with any other tendering entities submitting tender offers and have no other relationship with any of the tenderers or those responsible for compiling the scope of work that could cause or be interpreted as a conflict of interest.
- IV. confirms that the contents of this questionnaire/forms (SBD 4) are within my personal knowledge and are to the best of my belief both true and correct.
- V. accept that, in addition to cancellation of a contract, action may be taken against me should the Declaration prove to be false.
- VI. SANSA reserves the right to review the rendering of the Goods and Services under this agreement on intervals agreed upon and may terminate the services of the bidder for non-performance and replace same with the next highest scoring bidder in agreement with said bidder.
- VII. confirms that the percentage owned (table 1) refers to percentage of ownership by persons who are actively involved in and exercise control over the enterprise / company the bidder and that there is no fronting. Please note that fronting is a criminal offence under the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) Act. Individuals and



companies involved in fronting practices can face severe penalties, including fines and imprisonment.

- VIII. confirms that the bidder has read the General Conditions of Contract (GCC) and agree with the conditions. The GCC can be found on (<http://www.treasury.gov.za/divisions/ocpo/sc/generalconditions/>).

Signed

Date

Name

Position

Enterprise
name

BID CONDITIONS

1. Disqualification

Please note that if a bid document is not filled in correctly or completely, or complied with the specification, or is delivered/send after the bid closing date and time, or the supplier is not registered on the CSD or supplier has a non-compliant tax status, then unfortunately that bidder will be disqualified. Please return this document with the required supporting documents.

2. Bid Document Submission

Emailed tender documents will be accepted. However, the onus is on the tenderer to ensure that complete email documents have been received by the SANSA by the due date and time.

Please note that any alterations to the tender document other than filling in the tenderer's details and tender price will automatically disqualify the tenderer.

COMPLIANCE WITH PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION ACT, 2013 (ACT NO. 4 OF 2013) ("POPIA")

1. The Constitution guarantees citizens the right to privacy, including the right not to have the privacy of their communications infringed.

2. POPIA aims to promote the protection of privacy through the application of its guiding principles for the processing of personal information in a context-sensitive manner.

Committed to your Privacy

3. SANSA fully comprehends that your personal and company information is valuable to you; your privacy is just important to SANSA. SANSA commits to safeguarding and lawfully processing your personal information.

Purpose for Processing your Personal Information

4. SANSA collects, holds, uses and discloses your personal information mainly to provide you with access to its services. SANSA will only process your personal information for a purpose you would reasonably expect, including:

- Complying with any legal and regulatory requirements such as contract agreements, etc.



- Confirming, verifying and updating your details.
- Invoicing or paying you to ensure payment and tax compliance.

5. SANSA may collect your personal information which may include your first name and last name, company name and its registration number, identity numbers, email address, physical or postal address, other contact information, banking details, etc.

Consent to Disclose and Share your Personal Information

6. SANSA may need to share your personal information, with third parties, to provide advice, and/or services. Where SANSA shares your personal information, it will take all reasonable precautions to ensure that the third party will treat your personal information with the same level of protection as required by SANSA.

Request and Access to your Personal Information

7. Should you require further information on this or have any concerns about how your personal information is processed or used, you can contact SANSA on popi_paia@sansa.org.za. **(PLEASE NOTE:** This email address is restricted to POPI and PAIA-related enquiries, not general enquiries about bids and tenders.

8. You can request access to the personal information SANSA has on you at any time. If you think that SANSA has outdated information, you may request to update or correct it. You can also opt-out and request the removal of your personal information at any time. If there are any lawful reasons for requiring SANSA to retain any information, SANSA will advise so.

9. **PLEASE TAKE NOTE** that your personal information is securely hosted on infrastructure/system managed by SANSA. SANSA assures you that your information will not be shared for any marketing or promotional purposes without your consent.

10. SANSA will continue to manage, monitor, refine and develop policies, processes and systems. This will ensure that SANSA takes every practical and reasonable step(s) to ensure data protection, is in line with POPIA.

END