



## REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ) PROCUREMENT ANALYTICS AND VALUE-FOR-MONEY REVIEW SERVICES

*With potential forensic follow-up on suspicious transactions and bid-rigging indicators*

<b>Reference Number</b>	IZIKO-FIN-RFQ-2026/06/11
<b>Description</b>	Appointment of a suitably qualified and experienced service provider to conduct a procurement analytics and value-for-money review, flag suspicious transactions and indicators of bid-rigging or related procurement manipulation, and perform approved forensic follow-up work where required.
<b>Address</b>	Iziko South African Museum 25 Queen Victoria Street Cape Town 8001
<b>Attention</b>	Siphamandla Oupa
<b>Site Visit</b>	N/A
<b>Advert Date</b>	11 June 2026
<b>Closing Date and Time for Submission</b>	23 June 2026 at 11h00am
<b>Method of Delivery</b>	Quotes / proposals and accompanying documentation must be emailed to SCM: <a href="mailto:sgwampi@iziko.org.za">sgwampi@iziko.org.za</a> and <a href="mailto:scm@iziko.org.za">scm@iziko.org.za</a>
<b>Technical Enquiries</b>	Siphamandla Oupa: <a href="mailto:soupa@iziko.org.za">soupa@iziko.org.za</a>
<b>Name of Company</b>	
<b>CSD Supplier Number (MA Number)</b>	
<b>B-BBEE Status Level of Contribution</b>	
<b>Quote Price (Incl. VAT)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	



## 1. Background to Iziko

Iziko Museums of South Africa is a Schedule 3A public entity and non-profit organisation, partly subsidised by the National Department of Sport, Arts and Culture. Iziko brings together national museums and a Social History Centre situated in the Western Cape under a single governance and leadership structure.

Iziko operates within a public finance environment and must ensure that procurement and expenditure deliver value for money, support the institution's mandate, and comply with applicable legislation, policies and internal controls. In the context of fiscal pressure, constrained resources and heightened governance expectations, Iziko requires a focused procurement analytics and value-for-money review to identify wastage, suspicious procurement patterns and opportunities for improvement.

## 2. Purpose of the RFQ

The purpose of this RFQ is to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced service provider to conduct a procurement analytics and value-for-money review. The engagement must identify procurement inefficiencies, wastage, control weaknesses, suspicious transactions, indicators of possible bid-rigging or related procurement manipulation, and opportunities for improved procurement performance.

The assignment is primarily a procurement analytics exercise with a strong value-for-money emphasis. Forensic follow-up work may be activated only where the analytics process identifies suspicious transactions or high-risk matters requiring deeper investigation, and only upon written instruction by Iziko.

## 3. Scope of Work

### 3.1 Primary scope: procurement analytics and value-for-money review

- Analyse procurement and financial data to identify wastage, avoidable costs, abnormal trends and weak value-for-money outcomes.
- Review procurement planning, sourcing methods, emergency procurement, deviations, quotations, awards, contract usage, supplier performance and payment patterns.
- Identify transactions, suppliers or procurement patterns that may indicate split procurement, repeated awards, abnormal pricing, quotation manipulation, supplier rotation, cover quoting, conflict-of-interest indicators, bid-rigging or related procurement manipulation.
- Assess whether goods and services procured were delivered, under-delivered, delivered late, delivered at unreasonable cost, or not adequately supported by evidence of receipt and performance.
- Review consequence management practices linked to non-delivery, under-delivery, poor supplier performance, procurement non-compliance, emergency procurement and value-for-money failures.
- Identify practical opportunities for improved procurement efficiency, cost containment, contract management, supplier performance management, control strengthening and potential revenue or value optimisation.

### 3.2 Follow-up scope: approved forensic follow-up work

Where suspicious transactions or high-risk procurement patterns are identified, Iziko may instruct the service provider to perform follow-up work in line with the existing investigation terms. This follow-up work must be separately approved in writing and may include document review, interviews, evidence gathering, digital forensic analysis and preparation of forensic reports suitable for management action, consequence management, recovery action, disciplinary processes, criminal referral or other appropriate remedies.

The service provider must therefore demonstrate access to forensic capacity, including cellphone and computer analysis capability, where lawfully authorised and required.

## 4. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

Deliverable	Minimum requirement
Procurement Analytics and Value-for-Money Report	Detailed report on procurement wastage, inefficiencies, value-for-money concerns, emergency procurement patterns, non-delivery, under-delivery, contract management weaknesses and consequence management gaps.

Deliverable	Minimum requirement
Suspicious Transactions Register	Register of transactions, suppliers, quotations, awards, payments or procurement patterns flagged for further review, including reason for flagging, risk indicator, value, supplier, supporting information, risk rating and recommended action.
Bid-Rigging and Related Indicators Assessment	Assessment of possible indicators of bid-rigging, collusion, cover quoting, supplier rotation, quotation manipulation, abnormal pricing, repeated awards to related suppliers, split procurement and conflict-of-interest indicators.
Root-Cause and Control Weakness Analysis	Identification of root causes behind procurement wastage, weak value-for-money outcomes, non-delivery, under-delivery, control failures, poor contract management and inadequate consequence management.
Management Action and Improvement Roadmap	Practical recommendations with responsible functions, priority ranking, timelines and measurable implementation actions.
Forensic Follow-Up Reports, Where Required	For approved follow-up work, forensic reports supported by appropriate evidence, interviews, document review, digital forensic analysis where applicable and clear recommendations.
EXCO and Council Reporting	Presentation of key findings, suspicious transactions, value-for-money concerns, risk implications and recommended actions to EXCO, Council or a designated governance structure.

## 5. Project Charter

The successful service provider will be required to sign a project charter before commencement of the assignment. The project charter must define the project objectives, scope, methodology, timelines, deliverables, roles and responsibilities, reporting protocols, data access requirements, confidentiality obligations, escalation protocols, quality assurance arrangements and the process for approving any forensic follow-up work arising from the procurement analytics review.

Forensic follow-up work will not commence automatically. It must be approved in writing by Iziko after consideration of the suspicious transactions register and initial procurement analytics findings.

## 6. Required Expertise and Capacity

- Procurement analytics and spend analysis capability.
- Public sector SCM and PFMA environment experience.
- Value-for-money review experience.
- Forensic finance and investigation capability.
- Ability to identify bid-rigging and procurement manipulation indicators.
- Digital forensic capacity, including computer and cellphone analysis where lawfully authorised.
- Evidence preservation, chain-of-custody and forensic reporting capability.
- Experience in reporting to executive management, audit and risk structures, boards or councils.

## 7. Administrative Documents

No.	Document required
1	Central Supplier Database report with supplier number, company details and tax status verification pin.
2	Detailed pricing structure on company letterhead, inclusive of VAT, disbursements and escalations if applicable.
3	Valid B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit.
4	Signed RFQ document.
5	Valid tax certificate and/or tax pin.

No.	Document required
6	Completed SBD 4 and SBD 6.1 forms.
7	Company capability profile addressing procurement analytics, value-for-money reviews, forensic finance and digital forensic capacity.
8	CVs and qualifications/certifications of key personnel assigned to the project.
9	Evidence of at least three similar completed projects.
10	Independence and conflict-of-interest declaration.

## 8. Mandatory Requirements

Requirement	Evidence required
CSD and tax compliance	CSD report and valid tax pin.
Completed and signed bid documents	Signed RFQ, SBD 4 and SBD 6.1.
Three similar projects	Appointment letters, completion letters, reference letters or signed client confirmations.
Multidisciplinary capability	CVs showing procurement analytics, SCM, value-for-money, forensic finance and digital forensic capacity.
Digital forensic capacity	Profile of internal capacity or formally identified specialist partner/subcontractor, including computer and cellphone analysis capability.
Independence	Signed declaration of no conflict with Iziko, officials, Council members, SCM personnel or suppliers likely to be reviewed.

Failure to meet any mandatory requirement may render the submission non-responsive.

## 9. Evaluation Criteria

Bidders must achieve a minimum functionality score of 70 points out of 100 to proceed to price and specific goals evaluation. Bidders scoring below 70 points will be regarded as technically non-responsive and will not be evaluated further.

No.	Functionality criterion	Weight
1	Company experience in procurement analytics, forensic finance, SCM reviews and value-for-money assignments.	40
2	Technical methodology for procurement analytics, wastage identification, suspicious transaction flagging, value-for-money review and bid-rigging indicators.	30
2	Key personnel qualifications and experience across procurement, SCM, finance, analytics, forensic and assurance disciplines.	30
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

## 10. Detailed Scoring Guidelines

Criterion	Maximum points	Scoring guidance
Company experience	40	<p><b>40 points:</b> The bidder provides documentary evidence that the company has completed at least 3 relevant assignments in the last 5 years involving procurement analytics, SCM review, value-for-money review, forensic finance review, procurement data analysis, supplier pattern analysis, expenditure leakage analysis, bid-rigging indicator review, contract management review, irregular expenditure review, consequence management review, or similar public sector/procurement-related assignments. Evidence must include at least three appointment letters, completion letters, reference letters, signed client confirmations, or project summaries clearly indicating the client, nature of work, period of assignment and deliverables.</p> <p><b>30 points:</b> The bidder provides evidence of 2 relevant assignments in the last 5 years that are sufficiently aligned to the scope, but the experience does not fully cover procurement analytics, value-for-money and forensic/procurement review elements.</p> <p><b>20 points:</b> The bidder provides evidence of 1 relevant assignment in the last 5 years or provides experience that is only partially relevant to the required scope.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> No relevant company experience is demonstrated, no supporting evidence is provided, or the experience submitted is generic investigation, labour relations, HR, legal or consulting work that does not demonstrate procurement analytics, value-for-money, SCM or forensic finance capability.</p>
Technical methodology	30	<p><b>30 points:</b> The bidder provides documentary evidence of cellphone and computer forensic capability, including evidence that at least one proposed team member, or formally appointed subcontracted specialist, holds at least one recognised certification or equivalent qualification relevant to digital forensics, mobile/cellphone forensics, computer forensics, cyber forensics, forensic investigation, fraud examination, or forensic data analysis. Acceptable certifications may include CCE, EnCE, ACE, GCFE, GCFA, CCO, CCPA, CCME, MCFE, CISA, CISSP, GCIH, CEH, CFE, or equivalent recognised qualifications.</p> <p>The bidder must also provide at least two of the following: CVs of digital forensic specialists; description of digital forensic tools or platforms used; sample anonymised digital forensic report; prior digital forensic assignments; evidence preservation protocols; or chain-of-custody templates.</p> <p><b>15 points:</b> Digital forensic capability is available through a named subcontractor or specialist partner, supported by at least one relevant certification or equivalent qualification and a signed letter of commitment, but the bidder does not have the full capability internally.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> The bidder claims digital forensic capability and provides at least one relevant certification or equivalent qualification, but provides limited evidence of practical experience, tools, prior assignments, evidence preservation or reporting capability.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> No credible evidence of cellphone or computer forensic capability is submitted, or no relevant certification or equivalent qualification is provided.</p>

Criterion	Maximum points	Scoring guidance
Key personnel	30	<p><b>30 points:</b> The bidder submits CVs for a named multidisciplinary team covering at least the following roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- engagement lead/partner, procurement or SCM specialist, forensic investigation specialist, data analytics specialist,</li> <li>- digital forensic specialist, and</li> <li>- finance/assurance specialist.</li> </ul> <p>At least one senior team member must hold a CA(SA), RA, CFE, CISA, CCE, EnCE, ACE, GCFE, GCFA, CCO, CCPA, CCME, MCFE, CISSP, GCIH, CEH, forensic accounting, forensic investigation, procurement, legal, data analytics, audit analytics or equivalent relevant qualification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The engagement lead must have more than 7 years' senior experience in forensic finance, procurement reviews, SCM reviews, value-for-money reviews, forensic investigations or related public sector assignments.</li> </ul> <p><b>20 points:</b> The team covers most of the required roles and includes suitably qualified personnel but does not fully demonstrate senior experience across procurement analytics, forensic follow-up and digital forensic capability.</p> <p><b>10 points:</b> The team has some relevant experience but is materially weak in one or more critical areas, such as procurement analytics, forensic investigation, digital forensics, value-for-money review or public sector SCM.</p> <p><b>0 points:</b> CVs are not submitted, key roles are not identified, qualifications are not evidenced, or the proposed team does not demonstrate the required capability.</p>

Bidders must provide documentary evidence for all claims made under functionality. Iziko will not award points for unsupported statements, generic company profiles, or proposal wording that merely repeats the RFQ requirements. Where prior experience is claimed, the bidder must provide sufficient evidence for Iziko to verify the nature, timing and relevance of the assignment.

### 11. Pricing Schedule

Bidders must complete the pricing schedule below. The total price will be used for price evaluation under the 80/20 preference point system.

Part 1 is the core assignment. Part 2 and digital forensic work are included as standardised provisional items for price comparison purposes only. Actual forensic follow-up work and device analysis will only be performed if approved in writing by Iziko.

No.	Service component	Pricing requirement	Bidder price, including VAT
1	Part 1: Procurement analytics and value-for-money review	Fixed fee for the full procurement analytics and value-for-money review, including data analysis, testing, bid-rigging indicator review, suspicious transactions register, report, meetings and presentations.	R
2	Part 2: Forensic follow-up on suspicious transactions	Fixed fee for a standardised provisional basket of 5 suspicious transactions/cases. This is for price comparison	R

No.	Service component	Pricing requirement	Bidder price, including VAT
		purposes. Actual follow-up work will only proceed with Iziko's written approval.	
3	Computer forensic analysis	Fixed fee for a hypothetical standard of 10 computers/laptops. This is for price comparison purposes. Actual computer analysis will only proceed with Iziko's written approval.	R
4	Cellphone forensic analysis	Fixed fee for a hypothetical standard of 10 cellphones/mobile devices. This is for price comparison purposes. Actual cellphone analysis will only proceed with Iziko's written approval.	R
5	Imaging, evidence preservation and forensic reporting	Fixed fee for imaging, evidence preservation, chain-of-custody handling and forensic reporting linked to the hypothetical device analysis above.	R
6	Disbursements	Disbursements must be disclosed upfront and capped at [insert percentage, e.g. 5%] of the Part 1 fixed fee. Disbursements will only be paid if pre-approved in writing by Iziko and supported by documentation.	R
7	<b>Total evaluated bid price, including VAT</b>	<b>Sum of items 1 to 6. This amount will be used for price evaluation under the 80/20 preference point system.</b>	<b>R</b>

### Pricing Notes

1. The **Total Evaluated Bid Price** will be used to calculate price points under the 80/20 preference point system (Only amounts captured on this table will be considered).
2. The standardised provisional items are included to allow fair comparison between bidders.
3. Appointment of the service provider does not automatically authorise Part 2 forensic follow-up work or device analysis.
4. Part 2 forensic follow-up work and device analysis will only commence after written approval by Iziko.
5. No additional costs, disbursements or incidental charges will be paid unless disclosed in the bid and approved in writing by Iziko before being incurred.
6. Bidders must attach a breakdown of assumptions, resource categories and rates used to prepare their pricing.

### 12. Preferential Procurement

Proposals will be evaluated using the applicable 80/20 preference point system. Only bidders that pass mandatory compliance and achieve the minimum functionality threshold will proceed to price and specific goals evaluation.

### 13. General Principles

- The lowest or only quotation received will not necessarily be accepted.
- Iziko reserves the right to accept or reject any quotation and to withdraw the RFQ at any time before award.
- The proposal and appended documentation may form the basis of an agreement to be negotiated and concluded in a formal contract between Iziko and the preferred service provider.
- A mere offer and acceptance shall not constitute a formal contract until the appropriate written agreement/ project charter has been concluded.
- Any alteration to the RFQ document other than completing bidder details and tendered price may render the submission non-responsive.



#### 14. Standard Bidding Documents (SBD forms)

SCM TO INSERT SBD4 here

SCM TO INSERT SBD6.1 here

False declarations will lead to disqualification of the bid. All declared information will be verified against available complimentary information/ documents including but not limited to CSD reports.

#### 15. Declaration

The undersigned warrants that he/she is duly authorised to sign this submission on behalf of the enterprise and confirms that the information provided is true and correct.

Signed	Date
Name	Position
Enterprise name	Contact details



### Annexure A: Bidder's Disclosure (SBD 4)

This annexure must be completed and signed by the bidder. Bidders must use the latest applicable prescribed form where required by National Treasury or Iziko SCM. Bidders must use the latest applicable prescribed form where required by National Treasury or Iziko SCM. The completed form must accompany the quotation/proposal submission (Section 14 of this document).

Required field	Bidder response
Name of company/firm	
Company registration number	
CSD supplier number	
Any Interest to Declare?	
Authorised representative	
Signature	
Date	



**Annexure B: Preference Points Claim Form (SBD 6.1)**

This annexure must be completed and signed by the bidder. Bidders must use the latest applicable prescribed form where required by National Treasury or Iziko SCM. The completed form must accompany the quotation/proposal submission (Section 14 of this document).

Required field	Bidder response
Name of company/firm	
Company registration number	
CSD supplier number	
B-BBEE status level / specific goals evidence	
Authorised representative	
Signature	
Date	

**Annexure A: Bidder’s Disclosure (SBD 4)**

**1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM (SBD 4)**

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 / shareholder / 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.

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:

<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.

.....  
 .....

**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;
- 3.2. 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.
- 3.3. 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.
- 3.4. 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.
- 3.5. 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.
- 3.6. 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 (Company Name)

<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.



**Annexure B: Preference Points Claim Form (SBD 6.1)**

**(SBD 6.1)**

**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**  
The applicable preference point system for this tender is the **80/20** preference point system.
- 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>	80
<b>SPECIFIC GOALS</b>	20
<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:

$$P_s = 80 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right) \quad \text{or} \quad P_s = 90 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right)$$

Where:

$P_s$  = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

$P_t$  = Price of tender under consideration

$P_{min}$  = 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:

$$P_s = 80 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right) \quad \text{or} \quad P_s = 90 \left( 1 - \frac{P_t - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right)$$

Where:

$P_s$  = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

$P_t$  = Price of tender under consideration

$P_{max}$  = 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	Evidence	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)
Persons, or categories of persons, historically disadvantaged- (HDI) by unfair discrimination on the basis of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proof of B-BBEE certificate;</li> <li>Company Registration Certification</li> <li>Identification Documentation.</li> <li>CSD report</li> </ul>		
<b>Race: Black persons (ownership)*</b>  50% or more black ownership = 20 points  Less than 50% black ownership = 10 points  0% black ownership = 0 points			

**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
- 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

.....

**SIGNATURE(S) OF TENDERER(S)**

**SURNAME AND NAME:** .....

**DATE:** .....

**ADDRESS:** .....

.....