South African Revenue Service

SOUTH AFRICAN REVENUE SERVICE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP06-2026

APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER FOR PROJECT AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

MAIN RFP DOCUMENT

INSTRUCTIONS, GUIDELINES, AND CONDITIONS OF TENDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 3
2 OVERVIEW OF SARS' REQUIREMENTS 3
3 BACKGROUND 3
4 STRUCTURE OF THE RFP PACK 3
5 KEY ACTIVITIES AND DATES 4
6 COMMUNICATION 6
7 TENDER PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION 7
8 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS 10
TABLE 5: MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA 12
9 TRUSTS, JOINT VENTURES, SUBCONTRACTING AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS 99
10 COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS 101
11 GENERAL CONDITIONS OF BIDDING 102
12 CHECKLIST OF RETURNABLES 112

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

SUMMARY, GUIDELINES, CONDITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is for the South African Revenue Service (SARS) to invite suitably qualified service providers (bidders) to submit proposals (tenders) in accordance with the rules set out in this RFP for an appointment as a service provider(s) on a non-exclusive basis.

2 OVERVIEW OF SARS' REQUIREMENTS

2.1 SUMMARY OF THE SCOPE

2.1.1 Details of the scope of work and the required goods and services are defined in more detail in the Business Requirements Specification document and other documents forming an integral part of this RFP attached herein as: ***RFP06-2026 – 1-2 Business Requirements Specification Document.***

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 SARS invites suitably qualified service providers for appointment of project and portfolio management information system for a period of four (4) years. SARS Enterprise Programme Management Office (EPMO) executes numerous projects concurrently, some projects are critical and urgent, while others are long-term and may span over multiple financial year. Continual management from project conception to close-out is necessary for the success of the projects, hence the need to connect multiple project strategies, schedules, business cases, budgets, scope definitions and priorities or objectives to achieve an integrated project portfolio. To enable the EPMO to do so, a robust, end-to-end enterprise project portfolio management and information system (PPMIS) / project and portfolio management and information system is required.

4 STRUCTURE OF THE RFP PACK

4.1 STRUCTURE

4.1.1 This RFP pack is organised in 5 (five) sections consisting of one or more documents in each section.

Table 1: RFP pack outline and contents

Section	Index	Description of section contents
1	**Main RFP Document**	Documents outlining the main RFP guidelines, instructions, conditions and documents necessary for a bidder to submit a proposal.
2	**Business Requirements Specification**	Document(s) outlining the business requirements specifications, technical requirements and other information required by a bidder to submit a proposal.
3	**SBD Documents**	Standard Bid Documents (SBDs) and other administrative documents that are required by National Treasury and SARS Procurement to be read, completed, and returned as part of a bidder's proposal.
4	**Contract management**	The General Conditions of Contract (GCC)
5	**Response templates**	Where applicable, response templates that are required to be completed and returned as part of a bidder's proposal.
6	**Mandatory Requirements**	Mandatory requirements that are required to be completed and returned as part of a bidder's proposal.
7	**Technical Requirements**	Technical requirements that are required to be completed and returned as part of a bidder's proposal.
8	**Pricing Templates**	Pricing response templates that are required to be completed and returned as part of a bidder's proposal.

5 KEY ACTIVITIES AND DATES

5.1 The table below lists certain key dates and activities relevant from the time of issue of the RFP up to and until the closing date:

Table 2: Key activities and dates

No.	Activity	Date / Time / Details
1.	**Bid Number:**	RFP06-2026
2.	**Description:**	APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER FOR PROJECT AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM
3.	**Duration of contract:**	The successful bidder will be appointed for a period of four (4) years, subject to SARS terms and conditions
4.	**Validity period of proposals:**	Bids submitted will be valid for a period of 180 calendar days from closing date. SARS may however, subject to the bidders' consent, extend the validity period prior to expiry thereof.
5.	**Advertisement of the RFP:**	**a) National Treasury eTenders Portal** **b) SARS Website**
6.	**Non-Compulsory Virtual Briefing session Location and Address**	**MICROSOFT TEAMS** **MEETING ID: 335 862 597 950 28** **PASSCODE: gg77Km64** **https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/33586259795028?p=aXUazOIvV6ykMjYdLv**
7	**Briefing Session Date and Time**	**15 July 2026 @ 14:00-16:00pm**
8.	**Bidders to submit written questions on or before:**	**04 July 2026 – 24 July 2026 @ 14:00 pm.**

9.	**SARS to respond to bidders' written questions on or before:**	**29 July 2026**
10.	**CLOSING DATE AND TIME (proposals due):**	**07 AUGUST 2026 @ 11h00 AM**

5.2 All dates and times in this RFP are South African Standard Time. The establishment of a time or date in this RFP does not create an obligation on the part of SARS to take any action or create any right or expectation in any way for any bidder to demand that any action be taken on the date established, or on any other date. A bidder accepts that if SARS extends the deadline (closing date) for proposal submissions for any reason whatsoever, the requirements of this RFP will apply equally to the extended deadline.

6 COMMUNICATION

6.1 All communications to SARS must be addressed to the SARS Tender Office, emailed to tenderoffice@sars.gov.za, and must contain a clear reference to this RFP. Communication sent by SARS must only be regarded as official communication if sent from tenderoffice@sars.gov.za, or a communication accompanied by a letter of authorisation signed by the SARS Procurement Executive.

6.2 A bidder may not make any communication to SARS regarding this RFP other than through the official contact provided in this document. SARS may, at its sole discretion, disqualify a bidder if the bidder communicates or attempts to communicate any information regarding this RFP to any of SARS' employees; officials; or any third parties involved in the preparation, evaluation, or award of the RFP other than through the official contact provided.

7 TENDER PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 SARS has a detailed evaluation methodology premised on Treasury Regulation 16A3 promulgated under section 76 of the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999), which prescribes that SARS' procurement processes be:

7.1.1.1 economical, efficient, fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective; and

7.1.1.2 consistent with the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act, 2000 (Act No. 5 of 2000), its Regulations, and the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, 2003 (Act No. 53 of 2003).

7.2 QUESTION AND ANSWER PROCESS

7.2.1 A bidder may submit questions to SARS as part of the question-and-answer process to gain a full understanding of any aspect of the RFP that is not clear to the bidder.

7.2.2 Between the dates given in paragraph 4, SARS will receive written questions sent by bidders by email through the official contact provided in this document. SARS will respond to these questions, but however is not be obliged to respond to a question which in SARS' opinion is inappropriate and does not reasonably warrant an answer. The questions and answers will be published on the National Treasury e-Tender Portal and the SARS website. The identity of a bidder who has directed a question to SARS will not be disclosed by SARS in such responses.

7.2.3 SARS may issue updated versions of documents issued in the RFP pack and/or may issue additional documentation to form part of the RFP pack. Such reissued or additional documentation will be shared with the bidders via SARS Website or eTenders Portal. It is a bidder's responsibility to ensure that a bidder uses the latest versions of documents in the RFP pack.

7.3 CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE

7.3.1 All bidders wishing to do business with SARS must register on the Government's Central Supplier Database (CSD) at www.CSD.gov.za, and to include in their submission their CSD Master Registration Number. The recommended bidder(s) must be registered on the CSD prior to an award letter / purchase order / signed contract being issued.

7.3.2 Foreign suppliers with neither South African tax obligations nor history of doing business in South

Africa must complete the questionnaire on the Standard Bidding Document (SBD) 1.

7.4 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

7.4.1 For this RFP, SARS will accept proposal submissions in the form of physical proposal submissions, either deposited in the SARS tender box or posted to the SARS Tender Office.

7.4.2 The physical proposal submissions must be deposited in the SARS tender box on or before the closing date and time at the SARS Tender Office, situated at the main entrance at:

SARS Procurement Tender Office,
Lehae La SARS,
299 Bronkhorst Street, Nieuw Muckleneuk, Brooklyn,
Pretoria, 0181.

7.4.3 The proposals may also be couriered to the address provided in the afore mentioned paragraph.

7.4.4 Proposals will only be considered if received by the SARS Tender Office before the closing date and time, regardless of the method used.

7.4.5 Late proposals will not be accepted.

7.4.6 The onus is on the bidder to ensure that its proposal submission and documentation received by SARS in this bid are submitted timeously and are accurate and complete. Failure by any bidder to discharge this onus will result in proposal submissions being disqualified for consideration.

7.5 INSTRUCTION FOR SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL

7.5.1 This section details the instructions to bidders for preparing a proposal in response to this RFP, which must be followed in detail to enable the information contained in a bidder's proposal to be read, understood and evaluated in a common and consistent layout, and to ensure that the information submitted is correct, complete and well structured. Should a proposal be received that is not in the correct format, SARS reserves the right to disqualify the entire proposal or portions of the proposal depending on the extent of the deviation from the format described in this document.

7.5.2 All proposals and supporting documentation must be submitted in English.

7.5.3 A bidder's proposal is required to be submitted in two forms:

1 x Hardcopy submission	One (1) hardcopy submission clearly marked. A "hardcopy submission" means an A4 ring bound lever arch file.
1 x Electronic submission	One (1) electronic submission of a complete copy of the hardcopy submission. An "electronic submission" means a memory stick (USB stick) containing a complete copy of the hardcopy submission. The onus is on the bidder to ensure that the electronic submission submitted is a complete copy of the hardcopy submission.

7.5.4 The hardcopy and electronic submission must be marked and labelled correctly, and must be outer sealed, wrapped and packaged, for ease of reference during the evaluation process.

7.5.5 **Mandatory/Technical and Pricing information must be included in separate folders. The Mandatory and Technical information must be included in "Folder 1", and the Pricing information must be included in "Folder 2".**

7.5.6 A bidder is required to submit the contents of its submission (hardcopy and electronic) in the following format:

Table 3: Format and organisation of proposal

Files		Section	Responses
Folder 1: TECHNICAL proposal	• RFP reference • Description • Bidder name	**1**	• Prequalification documents (all SBD and other documents) *excluding Price template*. Pricing template to be in Folder 2
		2	• Response to mandatory/ technical requirements (if applicable) • Supporting documents for mandatory /technical requirements (if applicable)
		3	• Company Profile • Supplementary information
		4	• The General Conditions of Contract (GCC)

Folder 2: PRICE and B-BBEE/ specific goals proposal	• RFP reference • Description • Bidder name	**1**	• B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit • SBD 6.1 Preference point claim form
		2	• Pricing response template / bill of quantities
		3	• A complete set of three (3) most recent years annual financial statements as detailed in this RFP

8 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

8.1 PROCESS AFTER THE CLOSING DATE

8.1.1 After the closing date and time SARS, will evaluate the proposals with reference to SARS' evaluation criteria. SARS reserves the right to employ subject matter experts to assist in performing such evaluations.

8.2 PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS (GATE 0)

8.2.1 SARS has defined minimum administrative prequalification criteria that must be met by a bidder. The table below contains the administrative prequalification documents that are required as part of a bidder's proposal, which must be completed and signed by the duly authorised representative of the prospective bidder(s).

8.2.2 Where a bidder's proposal fails to comply fully with any of the prequalification criteria, SARS may at its discretion allow the bidder an opportunity to submit and/or supplement the information and/or documentation provided within a grace period of **seven (7) working days** or such alternative period as SARS may determine to achieve full compliance with these criteria before disqualifying the bidder.

8.2.3 **SARS will disqualify a bidder who does not achieve full compliance of the prequalification Standard Bidding Documents (SBD) after the grace period provided by SARS.**

Table 4: Prequalification criteria

	Prequalification documents to be submitted	Instructions	Non-submission will result in disqualification?
1.	SBD 1: Invitation to bid form	Bidder to complete and sign the supplied pro forma document.	YES
2.	SBD 4: Bidder's Disclosure	Bidder to complete and sign the supplied pro forma document.	YES
3.	SBD 6.1: Preference points claim form	Bidder to complete and sign the supplied pro forma document, to claim the points for B-BBEE / specific goals.	NO
4.	Proof of registration on the Central Supplier Database (CSD)	Bidder to submit the proof of registration on CSD.	NO However, a bidder must be registered on CSD in order to be considered for award.
5.	General Conditions of Contract (GCC)	Bidder to sign the supplied pro forma document.	NO The recommended bidder(s) will be required to sign The General Conditions of Contract (GCC)
6.	A complete set of three (3) most recent years annual financial statements	Submit complete sets of three (3) most recent years annual financial statements in accordance with the requirements of the Financial Risk Analysis paragraph as detailed in this RFP.	NO

8.3 MANDATORY EVALUATION PROCESS (GATE 1)

8.3.1 Only Bidders that have met the prequalification criteria in Gate 0 will be evaluated in Gate 1 for mandatory evaluation. The table below contains the mandatory evaluation criteria.

8.3.2 **If a bidder does not meet any of the mandatory evaluation criteria, the bidder will be disqualified, and the bidder's proposal will not be evaluated further.**

TABLE 5: MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Mandatory evaluation criteria	Bidder to submit as proof
1.	**Bidder must provide proof that they are either OEM / software owner authorisation/ authorized partner or reseller.**	The bidder must submit a declaration on the Annexure A Mandatory Evaluation Template, duly signed by the bidder's authorised representative. ***Non submission of the required document will result in the disqualification of the bidder.***
2.	**Bidder must provide proof of local on-site support capability**	The bidder must submit a declaration on the Annexure B Mandatory Evaluation Template, duly signed by the bidder's authorised representative. ***Non submission of the required document will result in the disqualification of the bidder.***
3.	**South African data residency of the solution**	The bidder must submit a declaration on the Annexure C Mandatory Evaluation Template, duly signed by the bidder's authorised representative. ***Non submission of the required document will result in the disqualification of the bidder.***

8.5 TECHNICAL EVALUATION (GATE 2)

8.5.1 Only bidders that have met the prequalification and mandatory evaluation requirements will be eligible for the technical evaluation criteria. Such bidders will be required to provide a technical solution of the proposed goods and services, demonstrating compliance with SARS' requirements.

8.5.2 The technical evaluation will be scored out of 100 points, and bidders are required to score a minimum threshold of 66.67 out of 100 points will be considered for Price and BBBEE/Specific goals evaluation.

8.5.3 If a bidder does not meet the technical requirements evaluation minimum threshold, the bidder will be disqualified, and the bidder's proposal will not be evaluated further.

To ensure that an objective and consistent evaluation is conducted of the proposed bidder's solution a structured scoring methodology will be used. Each criterion is allocated a weight based on relative importance and 3- point scale of 0,2 and 3 is used to assess the proposal.

3= Requirement is "out of the box"

2=Source code changes required

0=Not supported

The weighted scores for all criteria will be calculated and bids that do not reach the minimum threshold of 66.67 will not advance to the next stage of evaluation.

Table 6: Technical evaluation criteria

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1	**Functional Requirements**	
1.1	**DEMAND MANAGEMENT**	
1.1.1	**Initiative registration** The ability capture/register initiatives in a standardised manner.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.1.2	**Initiative inventory management** The ability capture business case inputs including budget requirements, projected organisational benefit	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response”: A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.1.3	**Initiative evaluation capability** Prioritisation of initiatives against set criteria must be supported. These set criteria must be configurable on demand.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response;

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		(2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.1.4	**Initiative lifecycle management** Track the end-to-end lifecycle of an initiative using statuses, lifecycle gates, augmented information, dates, comments and stakeholders.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change.

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.1.5	**Initiative approval workflow.** Electronic workflows are supported/enabled for initiative approvals (configurable, on demand, parametrised triggers).	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.1.6	**Initiative risk analysis and management** Ability to support initiative risk assessment, risk mitigation planning and quantification of initiative risk.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.1.7	**Initiative What-if scenario planning and analysis** Ability to provide what-if scenario planning and alternatives for decision-making, considering prioritisation, timing, APP, strategy, MTEF, ENE and regulatory considerations.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2	**PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT**	
1.2.1	**Project and programme master record management** Management of defined project and programme master records, including stakeholder and financial information, etc.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.2	**Initiatives attribute management and configuration** Configuration and management of attributes associated with initiatives, such as status and type.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change.

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.2.3	**User definable portfolios or groups of projects** Ability to create portfolio, project and sub-project groups, including hierarchies.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.4	**What-if scenario planning** Ability to perform what-if scenario planning for time, scope, budget and related factors.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.5	**Portfolio Health status metrics and dashboard** Red/Amber/Green dashboard based on time, scope and cost metrics; configurable health metrics, tolerances and drill-down capability.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.6	**Initiative baseline management** Ability to keep records of all project and programme baselines.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.7	**Master Schedule Management** Must support the ability to create and maintain the EPMO master schedule/master plan and calendar through electronic validation of requests/approvals.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.8	**Multi-year project, programme and Portfolio inventory management** Ability to view project, programme and portfolio information over multiple years.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response":A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.2.9	**Full capacity and capability management module** Ability to: a) Approve resource allocation b) Track resource allocation and resource scheduling (including over- or under-allocated resources, resource availability, etc). c) Provide time management heat maps such as skills or capacity availability, constraints and bottlenecks. d) Track planned availability (forecasting) vs. actual (utilization) of resources. e) Ability to track time via timesheets.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.2.10	**Approvals and Validations** Electronic record validation and approval workflows must be supported.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3	**PROJECT AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**	
1.3.1	**Project/Programme stakeholder management** Must support role-based or named-person resource management, EPMO resource allocation management including capacity/skills, and stakeholder audit trail.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.2	**Project schedule import and export** Ability to integrate bidirectionally with Microsoft Project or equivalent project scheduling tools used by SARS.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.3	**High level consolidated schedule view capability** Ability to provide consolidated schedule views, including Gantt and/or PERT chart displays based on selected criteria.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.3.4	**Benefit Realisation Management** Ability to capture and evaluate project outcomes against benefit statements linked to user profiles.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.5	**Escalation, Risk, Assumption, Issue, Dependency, Decision and Watchlist Management** Ability to capture, manage, track and route escalation, risk, assumption, issue, dependency, decision and watchlist items for validation.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.6	**Visual display of critical indicators per project or programme.** Ability to visually display a) Critical paths b) Resource loading c) Resource levelling	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.7	**Change Request Management** Ability to capture and manage change requests per project/initiative, including user upload capability.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.8	**Lessons Learned Management** Ability to capture and manage lessons learned per project/initiative in a central location.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.3.9	**Configurable workflow capabilities and notification** Capability to configure various workflows, notifications, validation requests, and in-app applications. These include: a) Setting notifications according to predefined parameters (such as criticality, timeframes, and project-specific criteria). b) Validating information via a routing mechanism. c) Sending emails within the application. d) Managing in-app workflows for items such as escalations, risks, assumptions, issues, decisions, dependencies, and watchlist entries.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.10	**Customisable governance methodology processes, deliverables and artefacts** Ability to select elements from EPMO-supported lifecycles, including predictive, adaptive, hybrid and agile methodologies.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.11	**Governance conformance Management** Ability to track governance artefacts and adherence per project. Reporting must be system-driven and customisable.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.12	**Inter-project dependency** Ability to indicate inter-project dependencies.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.13	**Integration with SARS existing document repository** Ability to manage documents within the PPM system or integrate with existing content/document management or collaboration platforms, including SharePoint Portal, Documentum and others.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change.

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.3.14	**Archive project data on demand** Automatic archiving of project data as-and-when required	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.15	**Ability to administer standard templates** Configuration of standard templates by system administrators (forms, logs, non-conformance reporting) must be supported, including the following: a) Ability to configure the content of input screens and forms as per EPMO requirements such as Change Requests, Lessons Learnt etc. b) Ability to configure the content of logs such as (escalations, risks, assumptions, issue, decisions, dependencies and watchlist items). c) Ability to report on form and log non-conformance.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.16	**Personal calendar** Ability to provide personal calendars and update users from project schedules regarding upcoming deadlines and milestones.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.17	**Usability** Must support customised online help, EPMO glossary of terms and global search functionality.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response;

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		(2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.3.18	**Work breakdown structure management** Ability to create work packages and deliverables, break down substantial deliverables into work packages and allocate resources.	Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development. Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence.
1.4	**FINANCE MANAGEMENT**	

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.4.1	**Portfolio/Programme/Project Demand Planning** Ability to support ENE, MTEF and Annual Performance Plan planning.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.4.2	**Portfolio/Programme/Project Financial Forecasting** Ability to support estimate management and financial forecasting.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.4.3	**Portfolio/Programme/Project Cost Management** Ability to manage budgets, actuals, variances, thresholds, payment schedules, age analysis and related cost information.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.4.4	**What if scenario planning** Ability to perform financial what-if scenario planning.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.4.5	**Financial reporting capabilities** Ability to provide financial dashboards, including financial health indicators, earned value indicators, estimates and related financial reporting.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.5	**MANAGEMENT REPORTING**	

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.5.1	**Levels of reporting** Ability to report and aggregate information at any EPMO level, including Business Unit, Portfolio, Programme, Project and Stream level, across operational, tactical and strategic reporting.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.5.2	**Reporting capabilities** a) Power BI integration reporting capabilities b) Ability to set/configure reporting metrics (including absolute values, thresholds and tolerances) per initiatives c)Ability to report on historic (n-number of years) and current data d) Ability to provide standard (set reports) e) Ability to provide dynamic on demand reports (slice and dice/drag and drop) on various measures (e.g. finances, resources, etc.) f) Ability to calculate complex and sophisticated formulas.	Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development. Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence.
1.5.3	**Exception reporting and notifications** a) Ability to configure alert metrics: frequency, duration, importance, etc and escalation hierarchy per project b) Ability to configure reminders (parameter driven) per project c) Escalation alerts to various stakeholders (e.g. critical and high issues)	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.5.4	**Report scheduling** Report scheduling must be included, covering: a) Ability to schedule pre-identified reports and/or generate reports on demand b) Ability to provide up-to-the-minute real-time reports.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.5.5	**Report formats** Reports must be publishable/exportable in formats including MS Word, PDF, HTML or equivalent formats.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response":A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6	**SECURITY AND USER MANAGEMENT**	

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.6.1	**Permission Management** Ability to control functions, access and permissions by role and/or multiple user groups using user rights/profiling.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6.2	**Digital rights management** Ability to manage digital rights such as downloads, uploads and related controls.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6.3	**User authorisations** Ability to ensure only authorised users can view, modify, create and delete information managed by the solution.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6.4	**Audit trail management** Ability to generate audit trail records for user authentication and authorised activities undertaken while authenticated.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response “A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6.5	**Single sign on capability** Ability to integrate with Microsoft Active Directory or equivalent SARS user directory using standard API/interface to manage user profiles and access.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.6.6	**Field level access management** Ability for EPMO to administer security and access down to specific data fields.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. Te bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.7	**TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS**	
1.7.1	**Architecture: scalability, availability, performance** a) Ability to grow with SARS' future requirements — cater for changing requirements, scope, additional resources and transaction volume b) Architecture that will support evolving user interface requirements (web interface on standard browsers; mobile interfaces, etc.) Microsoft Web Browser (Edge) (Document evidence is required regarding future planned development and known scheduled upgrades)	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.2	**Integration** Integration, interoperability, and information sharing across collaboration boundaries must be supported, enabling information and ICT systems to work together seamlessly such as: a) Integration with business intelligence platforms must be supported, including SAP BW, Power BI and MS Teams. b) Integration with content and document management platforms must be supported, including the SharePoint Portal and Documentum. c) Data export capability must be provided to enable extraction of information for downstream use and reporting. d) Data import capability must be provided to enable controlled ingestion of information from upstream sources. e) Integration with incident management tooling must be supported, specifically Remedy. f) Integration with project management software must be supported, for example Microsoft Project. g) Integration with the SARS user directory must be supported, including Active Directory. h) Human Resources software integration (SAP HR)	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
	(A diagram mapping out the data repository and the real-time access of the solution front-end and reporting components will be required)	Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.3	**Configuration** a) Adherence to data protection regulations such as POPIA and SARS Security policies by ensuring that sensitive data is adequately protected, thus minimising the risk of data breaches and associated penalties. b) System configuration can be replicated for different defined environments (e.g. Training, QA, UAT and Production) as well as EPMO and Business-As-Usual areas c) Support for custom data fields is required, ensuring fields are fully accessible (i.e., available on screens and in reports) with minimal effort and without increasing maintenance or upgrade effort/cost d) The ability to customise menus and field labels is required without increasing application maintenance or upgrade effort/cost.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
	e) Administrative enhancement capability must be provided to enable authorised administrators to, on an ad hoc basis, add functionality such as buttons, calculations, and additional artefacts or pages.	identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.4	**Real time data management** a) Data update in real-time/near real-time and immediately retrievable from a central data repository b) Realtime integration or frequent batches to provide data as current as possible (A diagram mapping out the data repository and the real-time access of the solution front-end and reporting components will be required)	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.7.5	**Technical Integration Capabilities** a) Pre-developed APIs and ability to create additional integrations and APIs b) Ease of integration into SARS' current systems, Integration with e-mail, tasks, calendars, etc c) Able to import data via CSV, Excel or similar mechanism without requiring extensive technical skills d) Ability to automate data exchanges e) Ability to integrate with external BI analytical tools (A declaration document specifying the interfaces of the solution's components, detailing the interfacing with the mentioned APIs specifying real-time, seamless, or other will be required)	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.6	**User Device Compatibility and integration** Solution must be compatible with SARS user device requirements and software versions.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove the Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.at the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.7	**Off-line access** Ability to access and use the system offline, where required, with limitations and synchronisation approach described.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
1.7.8	**Cloud Based Solution (with South African Data Residency)** Ability to provide a cloud-based solution with South African data residency, where applicable.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change.

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
1.7.9	**Mobile solution** A mobile solution must be provided or supported, where applicable to the SARS use case.	Score 0 = Not supported. No relevant returnable is submitted, the evidence does not address the requirement, the capability is only stated as future functionality, or SARS cannot verify the capability from the submitted evidence. Score 1 = Limited evidence. "Brochure only Response": A relevant returnable is submitted, but the evidence does not prove that the requirement can be delivered through the proposed solution or through a defined technical change. Score 2 = Source code changes required / custom build route evidenced. The bidder proves that the requirement can be delivered, but only through source-code changes, customisation, extension, additional module, third-party component, integration development or other non-standard build activity. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation showing the base capability or platform support; (3) technical solution design or architecture showing the required change; (4) development/customisation approach or statement of work identifying the change required; (5) implementation plan or configuration statement explaining how SARS will receive the capability; and (6) applicable technical artefacts such as API/interface document, data flow, security control description, report output design, deployment document, support model or licensing impact statement. Score 3 = Out of the Box or Configurable / full marks. The bidder proves that the requirement already exists in the current proposed solution and can be enabled through standard product functionality or standard configuration without source-code changes. Required returnable: (1) requirement-specific compliance response; (2) product/OEM documentation confirming the capability; (3) screenshots, workflow evidence, configuration proof or demonstration extract showing the capability in the proposed solution; (4) configuration guide, administration guide or setup evidence showing how SARS can enable and maintain the capability; (5) evidence map showing where each listed requirement element is proven; (6) applicable technical

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
		artefacts for integration, security, reporting, architecture, data, licensing, support or deployment; (7) current implementation evidence, signed client reference, OEM confirmation or demonstration evidence; and (8) explicit confirmation that the capability does not require source-code changes, future release, unsupported third-party product or custom development.
2	**NON - Functional Requirements**	
2.1	**KNOWLEDGE and SKILLS TRANSFER**	
2.1.1	**Training and Knowledge Transfer** a) Tailored training programme i) Training should be available in multiple formats (in-person, online, documentation, video tutorials) to accommodate diverse learning preferences. Bidders should provide a design for role-based training sessions, ensuring that different user groups (contributors and administrators) receive relevant, practical instruction that matches their day-to-day responsibilities. ii) Training material for contributors and administrators should be available in various formats such as manuals, self-service portal (for common issues), etc that will allow for the training of a changing user base. b) Provide a training sustainability plan for future years (such as recorded sessions and knowledge reviews etc). c) The number of personnel provided above is for year 1 only, procurement of training for subsequent years will be on an as and when required basis.	Score 0 = No training returnable submitted, or the submitted evidence does not address training and knowledge transfer. Score 1 = Training approach submitted, but it does not include role-based training for both contributors and administrators, or does not identify training formats and materials. Score 2 = Training returnable include: (1) training approach; (2) role-based curriculum for contributors and administrators; (3) at least two delivery formats; (4) sample or outline of training material; and (5) sustainability approach for future training or knowledge refresh. Score 3 = Training returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) training schedule or rollout plan; (2) training material index or sample pack; (3) self-service or knowledge repository approach; (4) knowledge review or refresher plan; and (5) roles responsible for maintaining training material over the contract period.
2.1.2	**Transition, acceptance and effective use across EPMO** a) A testing and quality assurance plan (including pre-installation and compatibility testing, QA/UAT etc).	Score 0 = No transition/support returnable submitted, or the submitted evidence does not address transition, support or acceptance. Score 1 = Transition/support approach submitted, but it does not include testing/QA, support arrangements and service level information.

© South African Revenue Service

	Evaluation Criteria	Scoring Criteria
	b) Description of support services during business hours (08:00 – 17:00) and extended hours (17:00 – 19:00) on working days Monday to Friday. i) The proposed Service Level Agreements. ii) South African on-site support (local support) capability of 1 x senior consultant (4-hour turnaround time). The senior consultant should have a minimum of 3 years' experience supporting the solution. iii) Off-site support as required. c) Explanation of how routine software updates and patches are managed to fix bugs and security weaknesses. d) Single point of contact account manager.	Score 2 = Transition/support returnable include: (1) testing and QA/UAT plan; (2) business and extended-hours support description; (3) proposed SLA/service targets; (4) local and off-site support approach; (5) software update/patch management approach; and (6) account management or single point of contact approach. Score 3 = Transition/support returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) compatibility/pre-installation testing approach; (2) local senior consultant profile or minimum experience evidence; (3) four-hour turnaround commitment or equivalent service commitment; (4) escalation process; (5) acceptance criteria; and (6) production support handover plan.
2.2	**SARS RETAINED TASKS**	
2.2.1	**SARS Retained Tasks** Provide an indication of what tasks and responsibilities will remain with SARS resources during implementation and ongoing operation. This requirement is intended to prepare SARS for delivery and adoption by clarifying internal roles, resource expectations, and dependencies that must be in place for the solution to succeed.	Score 0 = No returnable provided for SARS assigned tasks and responsibilities. Score 1 = Returnable do not align with (1) internal roles clarified; (2) resource task description (3) resource expectation; and (4) dependencies. Score 2 = Returnable include some but not all of the following: (1) Internal roles clarified; (2) resource task description (3) resource expectation; and (4) dependencies are provided. Score 3 = Returnable include all of the following: (1) Internal roles clarified; (2) resource task description (3) resource expectation; and (4) dependencies are provided.

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
2.3	**PROJECT MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH**	
2.3.1	**Project management methodology** Provide a detailed description of the project management methodology that will be followed to implement the PPMIS. The methodology description should demonstrate that the bidder can plan, execute, and govern implementation effectively and can structure the work in a manner suitable for SARS' delivery context.	Score 0 = No project methodology returnable submitted, or methodology cannot be verified. Score 1 = Methodology submitted, but it does not include implementation governance, phases, controls or acceptance approach. Score 2 = Predictive methodology returnable include: (1) project phases; (2) governance/decision forums; (3) deliverables per phase; (4) roles and responsibilities; (5) risk and issue management; and (6) acceptance or sign-off gates. Score 3 = Agile or hybrid methodology returnable include all Score 2 governance evidence plus: (1) sprint/iteration or release approach; (2) backlog or scope prioritisation method; (3) change control and decision gates; (4) demonstration/review cadence; (5) acceptance process; and (6) approach for aligning agile/hybrid delivery to SARS governance.
2.3.2	**Contractor project team composition** Provide a proposal on the proposed contractor project team with: a) the number of members. b) types of roles of the team. c) seniority of each contractor project team member.	Score 0 = No project methodology returnable submitted, or methodology cannot be verified. Score 1 = Methodology submitted, but it does not include implementation governance, phases, controls or acceptance approach. Score 2 = Predictive methodology returnable include: (1) project phases; (2) governance/decision forums; (3) deliverables per phase; (4) roles and responsibilities; (5) risk and issue management; and (6) acceptance or sign-off gates. Score 3 = Agile or hybrid methodology returnable include all Score 2 governance evidence plus: (1) sprint/iteration or release approach; (2) backlog or scope prioritisation method; (3) change control and decision gates; (4) demonstration/review cadence; (5) acceptance process; and (6) approach for aligning agile/hybrid delivery to SARS governance.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
2.3.3	**SARS project team composition** Provide a proposal on the proposed SARS project team with: a) the number of team members. b) types of roles. c) seniority of each required EPMO project team member.	Score 0 = No SARS project team returnable submitted. Score 1 = SARS team information submitted, but it does not include number of resources, role types and seniority required. Score 2 = SARS team returnable include: (1) number of SARS resources required; (2) role types; (3) seniority/skill level; and (4) expected responsibilities or decision rights. Score 3 = SARS team returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) required availability/effort by project phase; (2) dependencies on SARS decision-makers, SMEs or administrators; (3) handover/adoption responsibilities; and (4) impact of SARS resource availability on implementation schedule.
2.3.4	**Project schedule with implementation timelines** Provide a high-level end-to-end project schedule based on activity duration and implementation timelines.	Score 0 = No project schedule returnable submitted, or schedule cannot be verified. Score 1 = Schedule submitted, but it only provides indicative dates or phases without activities, milestones or durations. Score 2 = Project schedule returnable include: (1) implementation phases; (2) key activities; (3) milestones; (4) indicative durations; and (5) planned go-live or transition point. Score 3 = Project schedule returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) dependencies; (2) key deliverables; (3) resource assumptions; (4) acceptance/sign-off points; (5) testing/UAT period; and (6) transition to support/operations.
2.4	**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION /FEATURES**	

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
2.4.1	Additional Information and Features Provide details of additional features that enhance value to SARS, including benefit/value and enhancement of functionality, efficiency, user experience and scalability. This must include: a) A clear description of each additional feature. b) The benefit and value to SARS. c) How the feature enhances: i) Functionality ii) Efficiency iii) User experience iv) Scalability	Score 0 = No additional feature returnable submitted. Score 1 = Additional feature described, but no benefit/value or enhancement area is identified. Score 2 = Additional feature returnable include: (1) feature description; (2) benefit/value to SARS; and (3) mapping to at least one enhancement area: functionality, efficiency, user experience or scalability. Score 3 = Additional feature returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) evidence showing the feature exists or can be configured; (2) screenshot/demo/product documentation; (3) implementation or enablement approach; and (4) clear linkage to SARS use case or business outcome.
2.5	**LICENCING PACKAGES**	
2.5.1	Enterprise licensing and pricing structure Enterprise wide “Read access” through a web page (hyperlink) a) User scalability over time, aligned to SARS requirements: i) Year 1: 110 Read/Write users and 5 Administrators ii) Year 2: 122 Read/Write users and 5 Administrators iii) Year 3: 134 Read/Write users and 5 Administrators iv) Year 4: 148 Read/Write users and 5 Administrators b) Concurrent Subscription-based pricing model, as required by SARS (As evidence the Bidder has to provide a document detailing licencing configuration)	Score 0 = No licensing returnable submitted, or returnable confirms only a named-user model that does not support SARS concurrent subscription requirement Score 1 = Licensing returnable submitted, but it does not clearly address concurrent subscription, enterprise read access, administrators and Year 1 to Year 4 scalability. Score 2 = Licensing returnable include: (1) licensing configuration document; (2) subscription model description; (3) Year 1 to Year 4 user scalability; (4) administrator licensing; and (5) enterprise read-access approach. Score 3 = Licensing returnable include all Score 2 evidence plus: (1) concurrent subscription model confirmation; (2) pricing schedule aligned to Years 1 to 4; (3) read/write and administrator user assumptions; (4) scalability rules; (5) support/maintenance cost treatment; and (6) confirmation of any licensing constraints or dependencies.

© South African Revenue Service

Evaluation Criteria		Scoring Criteria
2.6.1	Bidders experience and References Declaration letter of the number of Customers that the Bidder supplied and implemented the Project and Portfolio Management Information System. Bidder must provide a declaration letter demonstrating their track record and capability of the service rendered on Project and Portfolio Management Information System in the past five (5) years. NB: The declaration letter must highlight the bidder's relevant experience. The letter must be on the company letterhead, it must be contactable reference, must contain the start and end date of the supply and implementation provided to each Customer, and be dated and signed by a director authorised to represent the bidder.	Bidder provided the declaration letter that contains contactable references, the number of customers that the bidder supplied, implemented and maintained the Project and Portfolio Management information system inclusive of customer specific affirmations with the past five (5) years. Score 0 = No customer mentioned in the declaration. Score 1 = One (1) Customer mentioned in the declaration letter Score 2 = Two (2) customers mentioned in the declaration letter Score 3 = Three (3) or more customers mentioned in the declaration letter.

© South African Revenue Service

8.6 PRICE AND B-BBEE/SPECIFIC GOALS EVALUATION (GATE 3)

8.6.1 Bidders will be evaluated in line with the requirements of the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act, 2000, and its Regulations and SARS Preferential Procurement Policy.

8.6.2 SARS will apply the applicable preference point system in accordance with published preference point system. Should actual pricing proposals submitted by the bidders differ from the estimated costs prescribing the system to be used, the lowest acceptable tender will be used to determine the applicable preference point system.

Table 7: Price and B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation

	Criteria	Points
1.	Price	80
2.	Specific goals	20
	TOTAL	**100**

8.6.3 PRICE EVALUATION (GATE 3, STAGE 1)

8.6.3.1 Points for the price evaluation will be calculated in accordance with the formula stated below.

8.6.3.2 Bidders are required to complete all line items in the pricing response template provided by SARS, which will be used for the price evaluation. The price should be all-inclusive for all the goods and services required in the scope of work, and bidders must ensure the completeness and accuracy of the pricing figures provided in the pricing response template. Failure to complete the pricing response template/bill of quantities may lead to a bidder scoring zero for the pricing evaluation or disqualification of the bidder.

TABLE 8: PRICING EVALUATION FORMULA

Price evaluation formula	Points
$Ps = 80\left(1 - \frac{Pt - P\min}{P\min}\right)$	80

Where

Ps	=	Points scored for price of proposal under consideration
Pt	=	Rand value of proposal under consideration
*P*min	=	Rand value of lowest acceptable proposal

8.6.4 **B-BBEE/SPECIFIC GOALS EVALUATION (GATE 3, STAGE 2)**

8.6.4.1 Points for the B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation will be allocated in accordance with bidder's size as per table 1 of the SBD 6.1 Preference points claim form claimed. Points for specific goals can only be awarded to a bidder who submits a valid B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit with the SBD 6.1 Preference points claim form.

8.6.4.2 **Bidders are required to refer to the SBD 6.1 Preference Points Claim Form in terms of the Preferential Procurement Regulations 2022, for the specific goals and points to be claimed for this RFP.**

8.6.4.3 Bidders who do not claim preference points will be scored zero for B-BBEE/specific goals.

8.6.4.4 Failure of a bidder to submit the required supporting documentation in support of claiming the preference points for B-BBEE/specific goals together with the proposal, will be interpreted to mean that preference points for B-BBEE/specific goals are not claimed.

8.6.4.5 The B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit should be submitted in the name of the bidding entity. If the proposal is submitted by an incorporated joint venture, the incorporated joint venture must submit their B-BBEE status level verification certificate or sworn affidavit. If the proposal is submitted by an unincorporated joint venture / consortium arrangement, the unincorporated joint venture / consortium must submit a consolidated B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit as if they were a group structure, and that such consolidated B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit is prepared for every separate proposal.

8.6.4.6 SARS reserves the right to request bidders to submit proof of any information, to substantiate claims made about their B-BBEE status.

Table 9: B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation points allocation

B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation criteria	Points
Bidders to submit: a) A duly completed SBD 6.1 Preference point claim form, and b) A valid B-BBEE certificate or sworn affidavit	20

8.6.4.7 The following table indicates the specific B-BBEE/specific goals documents that must be submitted for this RFP.

Table 10: B-BBEE/specific goals documents checklist

	Classification	Turnover	Submission requirement
1.	Exempted Micro Enterprise (EME)	Below R10 million p.a.	• A sworn affidavit or certificate from CIPC.
2.	Qualifying Small Enterprise (QSE)	Between R10 million and R50 million p.a.	• A sworn affidavit only 51% Black Ownership and above; or • A copy of B-BBEE Rating Certificate from a SANAS accredited rating agency.
3.	Large Enterprise (LE)	Above R50 million p.a.	• A copy of B-BBEE Rating Certificate from a SANAS accredited rating agency.

8.6.5 CONSOLIDATION OF PRICE AND B-BBEE/SPECIFIC GOALS EVALUATION (GATE 3, STAGE3)

8.6.5.1 The points scored by a bidder for the price evaluation and the B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation will be added together to determine the overall points a bidder's proposal will score out of 100 points for the consolidated price and B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation and ranking of the bidders.

8.7 OBJECTIVE CRITERIA

8.7.1 "SARS reserves the right to award either the cloud-based or on-premises deployment option based on the solution that provides the optimum balance of risk, sustainability and total cost of

ownership over the contract term" This can be included as an objective criterion.

8.8 FINANCIAL RISK ANALYSIS

8.8.1 SARS may conduct a financial risk analysis on the bidders and SARS has the right not to make an award to a bidder(s) if its risk analysis indicates a high risk.

8.8.2 The bidders are required to submit complete sets of annual financial statements, for the three (3) most recent financial periods in the name of the bidding entity. The annual financial statements must either be audited or independently reviewed in accordance with the public interest score (PIS) in compliance with the Companies Act, Act 71 of 2008, and the bidders are required to submit the public interest score (PIS) in compliance with the Companies Act, Act 71 of 2008. The annual financial statements must contain:

8.8.2.1 A statement of profit and loss and other comprehensive income;

8.8.2.2 A statement of financial position;

8.8.2.3 A statement of cash flows;

8.8.2.4 A statement of changes in equity / net assets; and

8.8.2.5 Accompanying notes.

8.8.3 If the bidder cannot provide the preceding year's audited / independently reviewed financial statements as part of its bid submission, the bidder should submit draft annual financial statements or its latest management accounts, together with the three (3) most recent years audited / independently reviewed annual financial statements.

8.8.4 Bidders who have been trading for less than three (3) financial periods must provide:

8.8.4.1 A letter detailing the fact, signed by a duly authorised representative of the entity;

8.8.4.2 The annual financial statements that the entity can provide, considering the period that it has been trading; and

8.8.4.3 Any other information or documentation which would provide more clarity on the financial history of a bidder.

8.8.5 SARS reserves the right to request further information regarding the annual financial statements of a bidder at a later stage to demonstrate the potential bidder's financial capability. These will include, but are not limited to:

8.8.5.1 Holding company's / Parent company's accounts;

8.8.5.2 Management accounts;

8.8.5.3 Signed letter from a recognised financial institution confirming capital availability and bank statements; and/or

8.8.5.4 Credit rating reports (confirming capital availability or access to capital).

8.8.6 In the event of a subsidiary being the bidding entity and it submits the holding company's financial statements for financial analysis purposes, the holding company must furnish a Performance Guarantee that is signed by a Financial Service Provider (Guarantor) of the holding company, stating that the Guarantor will undertake to cover any or all risks associated with a bidder, in the event the bidder is awarded the RFP.

8.8.7 If the proposal is submitted by an incorporated joint venture, the incorporated joint venture is required to submit annual financial statements of the joint venture. If the proposal is submitted by an unincorporated joint venture / consortium arrangement, the unincorporated joint venture / consortium is required to submit annual financial statements of each of the parties to the arrangement.

8.8.8 SARS reserves the right to request a financial guarantee from the recommended bidder(s) prior to award, based on the financial risk evaluation outcome.

8.9 RECOMMENDED BIDDERS' DUE DILIGENCE AND RISK ASSESSMENT PRIOR TO AWARD

8.9.1 SARS has a legal and moral obligation to ensure that a supplier's financial position does not place public money or services at unacceptable risks and will therefore perform due diligence and risk assessment of recommended bidder(s)' prior to award.

8.9.2 As part of due diligence and risk assessment, the bidder must ensure that the bidder is complying to all regulatory prescripts, including industry regulations specific to the commodity/services procuring, that are applicable to this tender, as well as ethical business practices. SARS has the right to request evidence of this compliance from the bidder, and third parties, for purposes of the due diligence exercise and for audit or contracting arrangements.

8.9.3 In the event that a due diligence exercise reveals that a recommended bidder does not comply with SARS' risk appetite or compliance requirements then SARS has the right not to make an award to the recommended bidder.

8.9.4 The recommended bidder(s) will be required to consent in the agreement to continuous and in-depth due diligence to ensure ethical business practices throughout the term of the tender.

8.10 PROPOSED LEGAL AGREEMENT

8.10.1 Any award made to a bidder under this RFP is conditional, amongst other provisions, upon SARS and such bidder concluding a written agreement within twenty-one (21) working days of the bidder receiving the written agreement. The timeous finalisation of such an agreement will be an absolute pre-condition to the recommended bidder(s) being awarded the tender and providing the goods or services to SARS.

8.10.2 If the recommended bidder(s) fails to sign the proposed agreement within the time frame stipulated, SARS reserves the right to:

8.10.2.1 cancel the award to the recommended bidder;

8.10.2.2 enter into negotiations with the second ranked bidder(s) and conclude the proposed agreement with such second ranked bidder(s); or

8.10.2.3 take any other action SARS deems reasonable and appropriate.

8.10.3 Bidders are requested to-

8.10.3.1 Comment on the terms and conditions set out in the draft agreement and where necessary, propose required changes to such terms and conditions.

8.10.3.2 Each comment and/or amendment must be explained.

8.10.3.3 All changes and/or amendments to the agreement must be in an easily identifiable colour font and tracked for ease of reference.

8.10.4 Upon award, SARS and the successful bidder will conclude the agreement which regulates the specific terms and conditions applicable to the goods and services being procured by SARS. In this regard:

8.10.4.1 SARS will enter into negotiations with the bidder with a view to concluding the agreement.

8.10.4.2 SARS will be entitled to cease negotiating with a bidder if SARS, in its sole discretion, is of the opinion that: (i) the bidder has made misrepresentations in its proposal; (ii) the bidder is attempting to withdraw from positions or commitments made in its proposal; (iii) the bidder is not negotiating in good faith; or (iv) an agreement may not be expeditiously concluded with the bidder for any other reason.

8.10.4.3 SARS reserves the right to vary the terms and conditions of the proposed agreement during the course of negotiations with a bidder at SARS' sole discretion.

8.10.4.4 SARS reserves the right to accept or reject any or all amendments or additions proposed by the successful bidder if such amendments or additions are unacceptable to SARS or pose a risk to the organisation.

8.10.5 A bidder should note that the terms of its proposal will be incorporated in the proposed agreement by reference and that SARS relies upon the bidder's proposal as a material representation in making an award to a successful bidder and in concluding an agreement with the bidder. It follows therefore that any misrepresentations in a proposal may result in legal action or other processes by SARS against the bidder, notwithstanding the conclusion of an agreement between SARS and the bidder for the provision of the goods and services in question. In the event of a conflict between the bidder's proposal and the agreement concluded between the parties, the agreement will prevail.

8.11 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

8.11.1 SARS may prescribe certain performance standards (Service Levels) that a successful bidder must comply with in the performance of the services.

8.11.2 Failure to adhere to the Service Levels will result in SARS levying a financial penalty for the Service Level Failure.

8.11.3 Multiple Service Level Failures with the SARS' prescribed Service Levels will constitute a material breach of the Service Level Agreement.

8.11.4 Notwithstanding the implementation of the Service Levels and Financial Penalties, SARS reserves the right and without derogation to any other remedies it may have in law, to terminate the Service Level Agreement for breach (persistent non-compliance) by the successful bidder.

9 TRUSTS, JOINT VENTURES, SUBCONTRACTING AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS

9.1 Proof of existence of a trust, joint venture, consortium and subcontracting arrangements

9.1.1 Where, for the purposes of this RFP, a bidder submits its proposal as a trust, such bidder must submit concrete proof of the existence of a trust. SARS will accept a registered trust deed as acceptable proof of the existence of a trust. The trust deed must include amongst others:

9.1.1.1 Details of the trustees of the trust; and

9.1.1.2 Details of the beneficiaries of the trust. In instances where the beneficiary is a trust, the trust deed of that specific trust is required.

9.1.2 Where, for the purposes of this RFP, a bidder submits its proposal as a joint venture or consortium (incorporated or unincorporated), the bidder must submit the joint venture / consortium agreement, which sets forth the following details:

9.1.2.1 identification of each party to the agreement in full;

9.1.2.2 the percentage ownership of the joint venture / consortium of each party to the agreement (if applicable);

9.1.2.3 the precise functions and responsibilities which each party will fulfil in terms of the agreement. This should include details of the delimitations of scope within the goods and services to be assigned to such a party(ies);

9.1.2.4 the anticipated percentage of the revenue that the party(ies) would receive (anticipated revenue that the party(ies) would receive as a percentage of the total revenue the bidder would anticipate receiving over the term of the agreement with SARS), if the bidder is successful; and

9.1.2.5 clearly set out the roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner and the remainder joint venture / consortium party(ies). The agreement must also clearly identify the Lead Partner, who shall be given the power of attorney to bind the other party(ies) in respect of matters pertaining to the joint venture.

9.1.2.6 If a bidder is submitting a proposal in the form of an unincorporated joint venture / consortium, the SBD 4 Bidder's disclosure form should be completed by each party participating in the joint venture / consortium agreement, and proof of CSD registration should be submitted for all parties participating in the joint venture / consortium for this RFP.

9.1.2.7 Joint venture members should be advised that each member will be held jointly and severally liable for the performance of the joint venture.

9.1.3 Where, for the purposes of this RFP, a bidder has or intends to subcontract areas of scope of the goods and services, the bidder must submit the subcontracting agreement, and must note the following:

9.1.3.1 the bidder must indicate the name of the subcontractor(s), the percentage of the contract that will be subcontracted, the B-BBEE status level of the subcontractor(s) and whether

the subcontractor(s) is an EME or QSE;

9.1.3.2 a bidder awarded a contract, may only enter into a subcontracting arrangement with the approval of SARS;

9.1.3.3 the agreement will be concluded between the main contractor(s) and SARS, therefore, the main contractor(s) and not its/their subcontractor(s) will be held liable for performance in terms of its contractual obligations;

9.1.3.4 the successful bidder must, at all times, be solely and entirely accountable to SARS for the performance of its contractual obligations in terms of the agreement; and

9.1.3.5 Without diminishing the bidder's accountability in any way for the delivery of the services, including the performance standards, SARS may require: access to and transparency in the subcontracting agreements; the full details of the functions which the subcontractor will fulfil in terms of the agreement including details of the delimitations of scope within the services to be assigned to such a subcontractor; monitoring and reporting of subcontractor's participation and performance to SARS; direct participation of subcontractor(s) in the account and project planning activities; and subcontractors' representation in governance structures and committees. SARS will, at all times, demand fair dealing in the relationship between a bidder and its subcontractor(s).

10 COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS

10.1.1 Should a Bidder have rational reasons to believe that the tender process is unfair or irregular, including the fact that the technical specifications are not open and/or are written for a particular bidder, brand or product; the bidder is urged to notify the Procurement Department within ten (10) days after publication of the bid and provide details of its complaint for SARS' consideration.

10.1.2 Any suspicious activity, including requests, approaches or calls asking for upfront payment to secure an award of a bid or in lieu of claims that the outcome of a tender can be influenced towards a particular bidder, bidders are requested to immediately inform the *SARS Fraud / Anti-Corruption* Hotline at *0800*-002870 or email at anti-corruption@sars.gov.za for further investigation.

10.1.3 The "SARS hotline" further provides an anonymous reporting channel for any unethical behaviour that a bidder wants to report.

11 GENERAL CONDITIONS OF BIDDING

11.1 **By bidding, a bidder, is deemed to have accepted all terms and conditions of this RFP; and is further deemed to have accepted that if successful, any award made will be made subject to the terms and conditions of this RFP.**

11.2 **Reservation of rights**

11.2.1 In addition to any rights which SARS has reserved to itself in this document or any other document in the RFP pack, SARS reserves the right in its sole discretion to:

11.2.1.1 make no award, or to accept part of a proposal rather than the whole;

11.2.1.2 withdraw, or cancel this RFP;

11.2.1.3 amend, vary, or supplement any of the information, terms or requirements contained in this RFP, any information or requirements delivered pursuant to this RFP, or the structure of the RFP process;

11.2.1.4 schedule additional briefing sessions / site inspections, and to conduct site visits, site inspections, product evaluations, local content evaluations, and/or perform audits including due diligence exercises on any bidder whenever SARS deems it prudent to do so;

11.2.1.5 no longer consider a bidder's proposal where adverse information about the bidder or its proposal submission has come to the attention of SARS, provided that such bidder is informed accordingly and afforded an opportunity to object;

11.2.1.6 subject to applicable legislation and conditions of tender, award a proposal based on which bidder is offering the best value for money, even if such proposal has not scored the highest points during the evaluation;

11.2.1.7 conduct a risk assessment of a bidder's capability to deliver the goods and perform the services in accordance with the specified service levels and/or achieve SARS' objectives;

11.2.1.8 request clarification or verification in respect of any information contained in or omitted from a bidder's proposal, which SARS may do either in writing or at a meeting convened with the bidder for that purpose;

11.2.1.9 conduct a due diligence on any bidder or its subcontractor, which may include interviewing customer references or performing other activities to verify information and capabilities submitted, claimed, or otherwise, (including visiting a bidder's,

subcontractors, or customer reference premises, sites and/or facilities to verify certain stated facts or assumptions). The bidder will be obliged to grant SARS with all such access, assistance and/or information as SARS may reasonably request. The bidder must respond within the timeframes set by SARS, failing which SARS reserves the right not to consider the bidder's proposal any further; and/or

11.2.1.10 request presentations from such short-listed bidders. All costs relating to the preparation of such presentations will be borne by the bidders.

11.2.2 SARS will disqualify any bidder, report to the National Treasury and take the necessary steps to restrict a bidder form doing business with the State, who:

11.2.2.1 engages in any collusive tendering, anti-competitive conduct, or any other similar conduct, including but not limited to any collusion with any other bidder in respect of the subject matter of this RFP;

11.2.2.2 seeks any assistance, other than assistance officially provided by a government entity, from any employee, advisor or other representative of a government entity in order to obtain any unlawful advantage in relation to procurement or services provided or to be provided to a government entity;

11.2.2.3 makes or offers any gift, gratuity, anything of value or other inducement, whether lawful or unlawful, to any of SARS' officers, directors, employees, advisors or other representatives;

11.2.2.4 makes or offers any gift, gratuity, anything of any value or other inducement, to any government entity's officers, directors, employees, advisors or other representatives in order to obtain any unlawful advantage in relation to procurement or services provided or to be provided to a government entity;

11.2.2.5 accepts anything of value or an inducement that would or may provide financial gain, advantage or benefit in relation to procurement or services provided or to be provided to a government entity;

11.2.2.6 pays or agrees to pay to any person any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or any other consideration, which is contingent upon or results from, the award of any tender, contract, right or entitlement which is in any way related to procurement or the rendering of any services to a government entity;

11.2.2.7 has been found guilty in a court of law or administrative or regulatory authority having appropriate jurisdiction on charges of unethical or improper conduct, regardless of

whether or not a prison term or penalty was imposed;

11.2.2.8 is listed on the National Treasury's Register for Tender Defaulters or the National Treasury's Database of Restricted Suppliers; or

11.2.2.9 whose tender contains a misrepresentation which is materially incorrect or misleading.

11.2.3 Bidders' own conditions

11.2.3.1 Bidders may not come up with their own terms and conditions, counter conditions, modify or vary any of the terms, conditions or requirements herein. SARS may disqualify any bidder who fails to comply with this clause.

11.3 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

11.3.1 If at any time a bidder identifies an actual or potential conflict of interest, the bidder must immediately notify SARS in writing. SARS reserves the right to exclude the proposal submitted by such bidder from further consideration, unless the bidder is able to resolve the conflict to SARS' satisfaction. If it comes to SARS' knowledge that there was indeed a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest, same will be grounds for the immediate disqualification of the bidder.

11.4 CONFIDENTIALITY

11.4.1 Except as may be required by operation of law, by a court or by a regulatory authority having appropriate jurisdiction, information contained in a bidder's proposal(s) may not be disclosed by any bidder, other than to a person officially involved with SARS' examination and evaluation of a proposal.

11.4.2 Throughout this RFP process and thereafter, the bidders must secure SARS' written approval prior to the release of any information that pertains to (i) the potential work or activities to which this RFP relates; or (ii) the process which follows this RFP. Failure to adhere to this requirement may result in disqualification from the RFP process and such legal action as SARS may deem suitable.

11.5 FRONTING

11.5.1 SARS supports the spirit of broad-based black economic empowerment and recognises that real empowerment can only be achieved through individuals and businesses conducting themselves in accordance with the Constitution and in an honest, fair, equitable, transparent and legally compliant manner. Against this background SARS condemns any form of fronting.

11.5.2 SARS, in ensuring that bidders conduct themselves in an honest manner will, as part of the bid evaluation processes, conduct or initiate the necessary enquiries / investigations to determine the accuracy of the representations made in the bid documents. Should any of the fronting indicators as contained in the Guidelines on Complex Structures and Transactions and Fronting, issued by the Department of Trade and Industry be established during such enquiry / investigation, the onus will be on the bidder / contractor to prove that fronting does not exist. Failure to do so within a period of 14 days from date of notification may invalidate the bid / contract and may also result in the restriction of the bidder / contractor to conduct business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten years, in addition to any other remedies SARS may have against the bidder / contractor concerned.

11.6 INSURANCE

11.6.1 The successful bidder will be required, on or before the effective date of the agreement and for the duration of the agreement, to have and maintain in force adequate insurance cover consistent with acceptable and prudent business practices and acceptable to SARS, which shall include, without limitation, professional indemnity and public liability insurance cover as appropriate.

11.7 INDEMNITY

11.7.1 If a bidder breaches any condition of this RFP and, as a result of that breach, SARS incurs costs or damages (including, without limitation, the cost of any investigations, procedural impairment, repetition of all or part of the RFP process and/or enforcement or defence of intellectual property rights or confidentiality obligations), then the bidder indemnifies and holds SARS harmless from any and all such costs which SARS may incur and for any damages or losses SARS may suffer.

11.7.2 A successful bidder shall indemnify, hold harmless and agree to defend SARS and its officers, employees, agents, successors-in-title, and assigns, from any and all Losses arising from, or in connection with, any of the following-

11.7.2.1 Third party claims attributable to any breach of the provisions of the Services Agreement by the successful bidder;

11.7.2.2 Third party claims attributable to theft, fraud or other unlawful activity or any negligent, wilful or fraudulent conduct by the successful bidder or its employees and claims attributable to errors and/or omissions;

11.7.2.3 Third party claims arising from or related to the death or bodily injury of any SARS agent,

employee, business invitee, or business visitor or other person on SARS's premises caused by the negligent acts or omissions of the successful bidder or its employees; and

11.7.2.4 Third party claims arising from damage to property owned or leased by SARS or a third party caused by the successful bidder's or its employees' negligence or misconduct.

11.8 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

11.8.1 SARS retains ownership of all intellectual property rights in the documents that form part of this RFP.

11.8.2 Bidders will retain the intellectual property rights in their proposals but grant SARS the right to reproduce any copyrighted works for the purposes of the tender process.

11.8.3 Subject to any specific provisions in any service level agreement, master services agreement, work orders or change orders or any other agreement concluded between SARS and a bidder in terms of this RFP, all intellectual property rights created, generated, coded or designed in terms of this bid to meet SARS' business requirements and needs will be, and remain the perpetual exclusive property of SARS. Successful bidders who so create, generate, code or design any intellectual property for SARS in terms of this RFP, undertake to provide SARS with full access to such intellectual property including the provision of security keys and access codes both during and after the bidders appointment as a service provider or vendor.

11.8.4 In the event that any bidder utilises any third party intellectual property, in terms of a license, to submit a bid, or that such third party intellectual property will be utilised to fulfil SARS' business requirements for the bid, bidders firstly warrant that they have the rights to do so, and secondly, agree to fully indemnify SARS against in any claims whatsoever arising from the application of third party intellectual property in the SARS environment and on the basis of SARS' indemnity rights in the Indemnity clause above.

11.9 LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

11.9.1 A bidder participates in this RFP process entirely at its own risk and cost. SARS will not be liable to compensate a bidder on any grounds whatsoever for any costs incurred or any damages suffered as a result of the bidder's participation in this RFP process.

11.10 PREPARATION COSTS

11.10.1 A bidder will bear all its costs in preparing, submitting, delivering, and presenting any response or proposal to this RFP and all other costs incurred by it throughout the RFP process. No statement in this RFP will be construed as placing SARS, its employees or agents under any obligation whatsoever, including in respect of costs, expenses or losses incurred by the bidders in the preparation of their response to this RFP.

11.11 PRECEDENCE

11.11.1 The terms and conditions of this document will prevail over any information provided during any briefing session or communication, whether oral or written, unless such information is official written communication, as set out per the Communication paragraph in this document, and that such information expressly states that it amends this document.

11.12 RESPONSIBILITY FOR BIDDER'S PERSONNEL AND SUBCONTRACTORS

11.12.1 A bidder is responsible for ensuring that its personnel (including agents, officers, directors, employees, advisors and other representatives of a bidder), its subcontractors (if any), and personnel of its subcontractors comply with all the terms and conditions of this RFP.

11.12.2 If SARS allows a bidder to make use of subcontractors, such subcontractors will at all times remain the responsibility of the bidder and SARS will not under any circumstances be liable for any losses or damages incurred by such subcontractors.

11.12.3 The proposal shall however be awarded to the bidder as a primary contractor who shall be responsible for the management of the awarded proposal. No separate contract shall be entered into between SARS and/or its client and any such subcontractors.

11.12.4 If a bidder includes evidence of experience of individuals that are not currently employed by the said bidder, then the bidder is required include in their submission a letter or agreement from the respective individual whose evidence of experience is included in the proposal, that the individual is aware and is in agreement that their evidence of experience may be included for tendering purposes, and that the said individual confirms to commit and will make him/herself available for the contract period should the contract be awarded.

11.12.5 If a bidder includes experience of an entity other than the bidder itself, then the bidder must include in their submission a letter or agreement from the respective entity that the entity is aware and

agrees that their experience may be included for tendering purposes. Copies of the signed agreements between the relevant parties must be attached to the proposal responses.

11.13 PROHIBITION OF PARTICIPATION IN RESULTANT TENDER

11.13.1 Any bidder, whether participating in a trust, joint venture, consortium and/or subcontracting arrangement, who participates in preparatory work on the basis of which another tender will flow, may not participate in the resultant tender because of the advantage of having been privy to the underlying preparatory work.

11.14 RFP NOT AN OFFER

11.14.1 This RFP does not constitute an offer to do business with SARS, but merely serves as an invitation to bidders to facilitate a requirements-based decision process. Nothing in this RFP or any other communication made between SARS (including its officers, directors, employees, advisers and representatives) is a representation that SARS will offer, award or enter into an agreement with the bidder.

11.15 SARS' OATH / AFFIRMATION OF SECRECY

11.15.1 SARS has a Policy in terms of which the successful bidder; key personnel or any other personnel as may be determined by SARS will be required, upon award, to individually take a mandatory oath/ declaration/ affirmation of secrecy. The award will therefore be made subject to the condition that the successful bidder along with the personnel referred to above comply with the afore mentioned Policy.

11.16 SCREENING AND VETTING OF A BIDDER

11.16.1 Acceptance of a bidder's proposal is subject to the condition that both the successful bidder and its personnel providing the goods and services, must be screened and cleared by the appropriate authorities to the grade of clearance in line with SARS' applicable policies.

11.16.2 Obtaining the necessary clearance is the responsibility of the successful bidder concerned. If the successful bidder appoints a subcontractor, the same provisions and measures will apply to the subcontractor.

11.16.3 The bidders shall supply and maintain a list of personnel involved on the project indicating their

clearance status.

11.17 **TAX COMPLIANCE**

11.17.1 It is a requirement that any supplier conducting business with SARS is tax compliant at the date of award of a contract / bid and remains tax compliant throughout the duration of their contracts with SARS.

11.17.2 **VERIFICATION OF TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS PRIOR TO AWARD**

11.17.2.1 SARS must verify supplier/ bidder's tax compliance status prior to the awarding of a contract.

11.17.2.2 No contract / bid may be awarded to a supplier who is not tax compliant.

11.17.2.3 Where the recommended supplier / bidder is not tax compliant, it must be notified in writing of their non-compliant status and be granted a minimum of seven (7) working days to submit written proof regarding their tax compliance status with SARS or proof that arrangement has been made with SARS to meet their outstanding tax obligations.

11.17.2.4 Should the recommended bidder/ supplier fail to provide written roof of their tax compliance status as contemplated in paragraph 10.17.2.3 above, SARS as the procuring entity must reject the bid submitted.

11.17.2.5 Accordingly, the supplier / bidder is responsible to provide SARS with proof of its tax compliance status which must be verified through the Central Supplier Database or eFiling.

11.17.3 **VERIFICATION AND/OR CONFIRMATION OF TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS DURING THE COURSE AND SCOPE OF EXECUTING AWARDED CONTRACT**

10.17.3.1 SARS reserves the right to request the supplier or successful bidder to provide written proof of tax compliance status at any time during the execution of the awarded contract.

10.17.3.2 Further, SARS reserves the right to withdraw an award made, or cancel a contract concluded with a supplier / successful bidder in the event that it is established that such supplier / bidder was in fact not tax compliant at the time of the award.

10.17.3.3 Furthermore, SARS reserves the right to cancel a contract with a supplier / successful bidder in the event that such supplier/bidder does not remain tax compliant for the full term of its contract.

11.17.4 In line with SARS's strategic objectives, the directors / owners of the bidding entity who are not tax compliant may be referred to the SARS tax compliance unit for further investigation in order to achieve full tax compliance.

11.17.5 In terms of section 3 of the Tax Administration Act, Act No. 28 of 2011, SARS is responsible for the administration of a tax Act under the control or direction of the Commissioner for SARS. Accordingly, SARS may as part of the administration of a tax Act exercise its powers*, inter alia*, to collect revenue due to the fiscus and enforce compliance with legislation administered by the Commissioner for SARS.

11.18 TENDER DEFAULTERS AND RESTRICTED SUPPLIERS

11.18.1 No bid will be awarded to a bidder whose name (or any of its members, directors, partners or trustees) appears on the National Treasury's Register for Tender Defaulters or the National Treasury's Database of Restricted Suppliers.

11.19 LOCAL PRODUCTION AND CONTENT

11.19.1 SARS supports and promotes local production and local content, environmentally friendly products, and sustainable sourcing.

11.19.2 To enable this objective to be adequately assessed and as part of contract management, bidders shall advise SARS of its local and regional strategy and its initiatives to involve, support and use local/regional entities and workforce.

11.19.3 The appointed supplier shall provide and use, for the performance of this contract, local subcontractors or locally acquired materials, equipment and facilities, to the extent available and within reasonable costs, to produce the quality and quantity of work and materials required by this contract.

11.20 VALIDITY OF INFORMATION

11.20.1 SARS has made reasonable efforts to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this RFP. However, neither SARS, nor its employees, officers, advisers or agents will be liable (directly or

otherwise) to a bidder or any third party for any inaccuracy or omission of any information in the RFP or in respect of any additional information SARS may provide to a bidder as part of the RFP process.

11.20.2 A bidder is deemed to have examined this RFP and any other information supplied by SARS to the bidder and to have satisfied itself as to the correctness and sufficiency of such information before submitting any of its responses.

11.21 **GOVERNING LAW**

11.21.1 This RFP and any resultant agreement shall be governed by the laws of the Republic of South Africa.

12 CHECKLIST OF RETURNABLES

Table 11: Checklist of returnable documents

	Checklist of returnable documents	Comply	Do not comply
1.	A hardcopy and an electronic copy RFP proposal submission has been submitted for this RFP.		
2.	The pricing information is included as a separate file (File 2) and is not included in the technical file (File 1).		
3.	The tender proposal has been organised as per the format required for this tender (paragraph 6).		
4.	SBD 1: Invitation to bid form has been completed and signed.		
5.	SBD 4: Bidder's Disclosure has been completed and signed.		
6.	SBD 6.1: Preference points claim form has been completed, points for B-BBEE / specific goals claimed, and signed.		
7.	Proof of registration on the Central Supplier Database (CSD) has been submitted.		
8.	General Conditions of Contract (GCC) has been completed and signed.		
9.	A complete set of three (3) most recent annual financial statements has been included.		
10.	Signed Mandatory Declaration form and OEM/ Reseller/ partner certificate or letter		
11.	All Technical evaluation requirements have been submitted with this bid		
12.	All the pricing evaluation requirements have been submitted with this bid and the pricing template has been completed in full and signed.		
13.	All the B-BBEE/specific goals evaluation and specific goal		

	Checklist of returnable documents	Comply	Do not comply
	requirements have been submitted with this bid.		