



SOUTH AFRICAN TOURISM

PART C: TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS- SAT TENDER 187/21 - BUSINESS EVENTS BRAND EQUITY STUDY

Summary of the Evaluation Phases (table below):

Table 1: Evaluation Summary

Phase 1 Administrative and Mandatory bid requirements	Phase 2 Desktop Functional Technical Evaluation	Phase 3 Price and B-BBEE Evaluation
Service provider s' responses will be evaluated based on table 2 below.	<p>Service provider (s) are required to achieve a minimum threshold of 75% to proceed to Phase 3.</p> <p>The Tender/Evaluation Matrix Cross Reference: Service provider s should reference the criteria to the portfolio of evidence in the bid proposal. – it is of vital importance that systematic scoring can be carried out.</p>	<p>The tender will be evaluated on either the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system.</p> <p>Once a tender is received, the lowest acceptable tender will be used to determine the preference point system to be used for the evaluation. Where the lowest acceptable tender is below R50 million, the 80/20 preference point system must be used and If the lowest acceptable tender is above R50 million, the 90/10 preference point system must be used.</p>

Phase 1: Administrative and Mandatory bid requirements

Without limiting the generality of South African Tourism's other critical requirements for this Bid, service provider (s) must submit all the documents required.

All documents must be completed and signed by the duly authorised representative of the prospective service provider (s). During this phase, service provider s' responses will be evaluated based on compliance with the listed administrative and mandatory bid requirements.

Table 2: Phase 1 Evaluation

Document that must be submitted	YES/NO	Non-submission may result in disqualification?
Confirmation of valid Tax Status		Written confirmation that SARS may, on an ongoing basis during the tenure of the contract, disclose the bidder's tax compliance status. SARS Tax Compliance System Pin (<i>South African Companies only</i>) CSD report confirming the bidder's Tax Compliant status.
B - BBEE Certificate 1		B - BBEE Certificate (South African Companies) or, for companies that have less than R10 million turnover, a sworn affidavit or is required. A copy of the template for this affidavit is available on the Department of Trade and Industry website https://www.thedti.gov.za/gazette/Affidavit_EME.pdf (Failure to submit sworn affidavit will result in non-compliant on preference points system) (<i>South African Companies only</i>)
Annexure A-Invitation (SBD 1)		Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Annexure B-Registration on Central Supplier Database (CSD)		All agencies including proposed partner/subcontractor agencies must be registered as a service provider on National Treasury's Central Supplier Database (CSD). If you are not registered proceed to complete the registration of your company prior to submitting your proposal. Visit https://secure.csd.gov.za/ to obtain your vendor number. Submit proof of registration. (<i>South African Companies only</i>)
Annexure D-Preferential Procurement SBD 6.1		Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Annexure E-Declaration of Interest - (SBD 4)		Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Annexure F-Declaration of Bidder's Past Supply Chain Management Practices - (SBD 8)		Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document
Annexure G-Certificate of Independent Bid Determination - (SBD 9)		Complete and sign the supplied pro forma document

Phase 2: Desktop Technical Evaluation = Weighting out of 100 basis points

All service providers are required to respond to the technical evaluation criteria scorecard and provide information/portfolio of evidence that they unconditionally hold the available capacity, ability, experience, and qualified staff to provide the requisite business requirements to South African Tourism under this tender.

Service providers will be required to achieve a minimum threshold of 75% in order to proceed to Phase 3 for Price and BBEE level of contribution evaluations.

Table 3: Phase 2 Evaluation

Deliverables / Performance Indicators Points allocation will be full points on satisfactory of the below criterion or none scoring of points for failure to submit satisfactory information refer to Table 4	Weight	Reference pages in bidders' proposal
Bidders relevant experience and knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bidder must demonstrate number of years' experience and expertise in the field of risk, ethics and fraud risk management. • Kindly provide a table of current and previous contracts relating to risk, ethics and fraud risk management indicating the client, contract duration and value of contract. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scoring Guide: ○ 0 years' experience = 0 Point ○ 1-2 years' experience = 1 Points ○ 3-4 years' experience = 2 Points ○ 4-5 years' experience = 3 Points ○ 5-6 years' experience = 4 Points ○ 6-7 years' or more experience = 5 Points 	10	
Approach and ability to meet deliverables: Bidders must provide a detailed description of how they intend executing the services from inception to completion. This must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Project plan with clear timelines and a process to be followed to undertake the tasks b) Identify the process of developing the strategic/ operational risk assessments c) Identify the process of monitoring and tracking progress on risk appetite and tolerance levels (financial and non-financial) d) Identify the process of developing risk management policies, frameworks, fraud and ethics policies and plans This criterion will be evaluated in line with evaluation matrix on Table 4. Bidders to present the approach to the BEC members.	40	
Company track record: The Bidders are required to provide minimum of three (3) contactable, credible client references where its services can be	10	

<p>verified. References should be presented in a form of a written letter on an official letterhead from clients where the bidder specifies similar services provided i.e. risk management, ethics and fraud risk management where the services were rendered not older than three (3) years. No appointment letters from clients will be accepted as reference letters.</p> <p>The below references letters will be measured in line with requirements above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is ideal that the reference letters be same with the appointment letters above and from the respective companies. • Three (3) reference letters = 1 • Four (4) reference letters = 2 • Five (5) reference letters = 3 • Six (6) or more reference letters =4 • Seven (7) or more references Letters = 5 		
<p>Valid Corporate membership with the Institute of Risk Management (IRMSA), The Ethic Institute (EI) and Association for Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None submission or irrelevant/invalid certificates =0 • One relevant (IRMSA/EI and ACFE) and valid certificate =4 • Two relevant (IRMSA/EI and ACFE) and valid certificates =5 	10	
<p>Expertise of proposed Project Leader to be assigned to the project:</p> <p>Proposed team leader should have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide copy of Master’s Degree in Commerce/ Accounting/ CA or relevant qualification. • Provide copy of a membership Certificate in Risk Management / ACFE or any other relevant certificate etc. ○ None submission of the relevant qualifications as indicated above = 0 ○ 1 years up to 2 =1 ○ 2 years up to 3 =2 ○ 3 years up to 5 = 3 ○ + 5 years up to 7 = 4 more than 7 years = 5 	15	
<p>Experience of proposed team to be assigned to the project:</p> <p>Proven experience of proposed resources to be deployed to provide the services.</p> <p>Detailed CVs of proposed team members must be submitted which must elaborate on areas that they were involved in.</p> <p>Number of years’ experience of the proposed team member must be clearly against their respective roles.</p>	15	

TOTAL	100	
-------	-----	--

If required, they will be at a high level where criterion will be identified that the bid evaluation team might be interested in looking more closely at. The bid evaluation committee will have the opportunity to ask questions and make notes of what they consider to be gaps in the proposals compared with how well the business requirements are satisfied.

- Bids proposals will be evaluated strictly according to the bid evaluation criteria stipulated in this section.
- Service providers must, as part of their bid documents, submit supportive documentation for all functional requirements as indicated in the Terms of Reference. The panel responsible for scoring the respective bids will evaluate and score all bids based on information presented in the bid proposals in line with the RFP.
- The score for functionality will be calculated in terms of the table below where each Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) member will rate each individual criterion on the bid evaluation score sheet using the following value scale/matrix:

Table 4: Functional Evaluation Matrix

Rating	Definition	Score
Excellent	Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential value, with supporting evidence.	5
Good	Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits . Above average demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential required services, with supporting evidence.	4
Acceptable	Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource, and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with supporting evidence.	3
Minor Reservations	Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations . Some minor reservations of the supplier's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence.	2
Serious Reservations	Satisfies the requirement with major reservations . Considerable reservations of the supplier's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence.	1

Unacceptable	Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the supplier has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource & quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence.	0
---------------------	--	----------

Phase 3: Price and BBBEE Evaluation (80+20) = 100 points

Only service provider (s) who meets the minimum threshold of 75% during Phase 2 will be further evaluated for comparative price and BBBEE level of contribution.

The total points for price evaluation (out of 80/90) and the total points for BBBEE evaluation (out of 20/10) will be consolidated. The service provider who scores the highest points for comparative pricing and B-BBEE status level of contributor after the consolidation of points will normally be considered as the preferred service provider who South African Tourism will enter into further negotiations with.

Upon the successful negotiation and signing of a contract and services level agreement with the preferred service provider all other service provider s will be considered as unsuccessful. That was tendered for.

In terms of Regulation 6 (2) and 7 (2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points must be awarded to a service provider for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table below:

B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor	Number of points (90/10 system)	Number of points (80/20 system)
1	10	20
2	9	18
3	6	14
4	5	12
5	4	8
6	3	6
7	2	4
8	1	2
Non-compliant contributor	0	0

Upon the successful negotiation and signing of a contract and services level agreement with the preferred service provider all other service provider s will be considered as unsuccessful.

END.