



<b>Request for proposals for:</b>	Diagnostic Evaluation of the Relocation & Rehabilitation Process for the Pomfret Community within Kagisano-Molopo Municipality in North West Province
<b>SCM reference number:</b>	<b>RFP-16/2282</b>
<b>Closing date and time:</b>	<b>11 November 2016, 12:00</b> at 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield Pretoria with provision of one electronic and five hard copies of the proposal.
<b>Compulsory briefing session:</b>	<b>02 November 2016@10:00</b> <b>Venue: Boardroom GO1A, 330 Grosvenor Street, Hatfield Pretoria</b>

## 1. BID INFORMATION

Information on the format and delivery of bids are contained in the attached bid documents. Please take note of closing date and date of compulsory briefing session (if any).

## 2. PROPOSAL FORMAT

- **Annexure A** must contain the published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure B** must contain the proposal and services offered.
- **Annexure C** must contain a summary of qualifications of employees and past experience.
- **Annexure D** must contain pricing information. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in the terms of reference and must be submitted in a separate envelope.
- **Annexure E** must contain all other forms / certificates required (SBDs, Tax clearance certificate etc. – see bid documents).

## 3. CONDITIONS OF BID

### 3.1. Administrative compliance

See bid documents

### 3.2. Functional Evaluation

Only bids / quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids / quotes will be scored by the Bid Evaluation Committee against the functional criteria indicated in the Terms of Reference.

Minimum functional requirements: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75%), based on the average of scores awarded by the Bid Evaluation Committee members.

The Department reserves the right to call bidders that meet the minimum functional requirements to present their proposals. The Bid Evaluation Committee may decide to amend the scoring assigned to a particular bid based on the presentation made.

### 3.3. Price evaluation: The PPPFA

See bid documents

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

Pomfret is a desert town located close to an old asbestos mine on the edge of the Kalahari Desert. The town used to be under the former Molopo Local Municipality administration which has since been merged with former Kagisano Local Municipality to form what is now known as Kagisano-Molopo Local Municipality NW “397”. Pomfret has an estimated 3 200 people and estimated 300 households.

In 2005, the Pomfret area was declared a health hazard by Government due to its location close to the asbestos mine. This declaration led Cabinet to take a resolution that the community must be relocated and integrated with rest of the South African society. In the interim, the national Government resolved to hand over the maintenance and control of Pomfret town to the national Department of Public Works. Subsequently, in 2008 a decision was taken to relocate the community of Pomfret to Zeerust and Mafikeng. The relocation process commenced where some of the community members were relocated, infrastructure maintenance and the provision of basic services was discontinued. However, some of the community members contested the relocation resolution in court and applied for an interdict. The interdict was granted in September 2008, which prevented Government from conducting the following activities:

- Relocating any person from the town of Pomfret to any other location,
- Damaging, vandalizing or demolishing any habitable property in the town of Pomfret.

As a result, of the interdict residents who were relocated to Mafikeng and Zeerust decided to return back to Pomfret.

#### **CURRENT CHALLENGES FACED BY THE POMFRET COMMUNITY**

The Pomfret area is currently under the ownership of the national Department of Public Works and as a result the District Municipality is restricted from sourcing funding for the provision of water services and / or other services. Water shortages has led to other basic services being affected as they are dependent on water to function such as:

- Electricity – Termination of electricity led to the disconnection of water supply as generators depend on electricity to pump water.
- Sanitation - waterborne sewerage systems.
- Solid Waste and Waste Removal – No refuse removal and illegal dumping is rife in the area.
- Provision of primary education – Educators refusing to perform their duties due to an unfavourable working conditions.

Subsequently, other government services provision were affected such as:

- Police station closure.
- Clinics closure.
- Limited road maintenance.
- Limited social welfare services are rendered to the community.
- Limited SASSA service provision restricted to the payment of grants.

In 2015, the Office of the President informed the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation through the Special Project’s Unit that they had received a complaint from a Pomfret Primary School principal raising concerns relating to electricity and water provision. The complaint stated that the community was without electricity since 05 December 2014 and this resulted in the disruption of water provision services to the community.

The evaluation seeks to provide answers as to how the relocation process was undertaken to date and how the planning wide system can be strengthened.

### **2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT**

To assess the implementation of the relocation & rehabilitation process of the Pomfret Community relative to the projects goal(s) and objectives in the period of review, including its associated policies and regulations. Successes and challenges in its implementation will be identified, and recommendations offered regarding improvements to implementation of the relocation process in the future.

#### **2.1 NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND FORECASTING**

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. What are the root causes of the issue or problem?
  - What is the current socio-economic status of the area?
  - What was the political commitment for relocating the area?
  - What are the service delivery needs of the community?
  - What is the scale and scope of the met and unmet needs?
2. What is already known and unknown about the issue or problem?
  - Development of a current community profile
  - What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the current situation?

### **2.2 OPTION ANALYSIS**

1. What are the options that could be considered to deal with the problem?
  - What happens if the community is relocated / not relocated?
  - Are the interventions proposed consistent with cultural and other characteristics of the target population?
  - What are the current intergovernmental relations?
2. Themes to be covered
  - Design, definitional and conceptual issues
  - Roles and responsibilities
  - Institutional arrangements
  - Capacity for delivery
  - Standard-setting and certification
  - Quality Assurance
3. What is the proposed intervention
  - Development of a potential theory of change that should be considered?
  - This question is related to sequencing the series of events (process map)

**Table 1: Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation**

Stakeholder	Likely use of the results
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	To strengthen coordination and to improve intergovernmental relation.
The Presidency – Private Office	To strengthen coordination and to improve intergovernmental relations.
North West Province - Office of the Premier	To strengthen coordination and to improve intergovernmental relations.
Kagisano-Molopo Municipality	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Public Works	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Defence	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Environmental Affairs	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Water and Sanitation	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Social Development	To inform the reallocation of resources.
Department of Mineral Resources	To inform the reallocation of resources.

### **2.3 Scope of the project:**

According to the initial engagements held between the DPME and the relevant stakeholders involved in the relocation process, the following stakeholders will need to be interviewed.

- All the affected government departments (mandated in the relocation plan) e.g. National and Regional Department of Public Works, Defence & Military Veterans, Education, Environmental affairs, Energy, SAPS, Office of the Premier, Kagisano-Molopo Local Municipality, Dr. Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District Municipality, Water and Sanitation, Social Development, Eskom and Mineral Resources.
- Nominated community leaders and community members.
- A sample of individual experts related to security, mining and environmental health.

### **3. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH**

A proposed methodology has been suggested, however this does not mean the service provider cannot recommend a different methodological approach they consider to be more appropriate to respond to the terms of reference.

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The evaluation questions can be best responded to through mixed method approach including document review, literature review, and primary data collection. One critical project activity will be the process mapping - sequencing the series of events, who are stakeholders/institutions responsible for creating an enabling environment, what are the terms of relations and the processes involved in the relocation process.

### **4. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES**

The project is expected to take place between October 2016 and June 2017. The following are the deliverables of this project:

- **Inception Report** by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, evaluation design and methodology;
- **Document review report and draft problem tree** which will provide preliminary findings from the analysis of the following documents:
  - Cabinet minutes – when the relocation resolution was taken.
  - Reports generated from the court case.
  - Pomfret project documents, reports, meeting minutes, plans and their related policies and regulations.
  - Review of both grey and published literature on the Pomfret relocation & rehabilitation project and its implementation.
  - Memorandum of Understanding between the different stakeholders (municipality, outlining the terms and / or arrangements.
  - Integrated Development Plans from 2005-2015.
- Literature review
- Analytical framework (report structure and data collection instruments).
- **Final Problem Tree** finalised after a stakeholder workshop which will use the draft problem tree as an outline.
- Fieldwork report.
- **Option analysis** which will be finalised at a workshop. The workshop will be a combination of a validation workshop and a stakeholder workshop to test the option analysis.
- **Draft overall report** for review, full and in 1/5/25 format.
- **Final report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic.
- Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected.
- A Power-point or audio-visual **presentation of the results**.

**Table 1: Outline of project plan and payment schedule.**

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Delivery Date</b>	<b>% payment</b>
Inception Meeting		
Submission of Inception Report		
Presentation of inception report for approval		10%
All parties sign the Service Level Agreement		
Submission of Document review report and draft problem tree		10%
Submission of Literature Review and analytical framework		10%
Presentation of Document review report and draft problem tree at a workshop		10%
Submission of final problem tree		20%
Submission of fieldwork report and option analysis		20%
Presentation of fieldwork report and option analysis at a workshop		
Draft overall report		
Full report		20%
Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts)		

### **5. SKILLS REQUIRED**

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website. The service provider will be assessed against some of these competencies:

## ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
<b>1 Overarching Considerations</b>	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 14 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments. Have knowledge of the local, provincial & national government system and its legislations.
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
<b>2 Evaluation Leadership</b>	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs) <sup>1</sup> and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table)
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
<b>3 Evaluation Craft</b>	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation, and use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods. Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
<b>4 Implementation of Evaluation</b>	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme log-frames with good programme logic and indicators
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Are team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.

<sup>1</sup> By PDIs we mean people of Black, Indian, and Coloured ethnicity. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **5.1 EVALUATION TEAM**

The service provider appointed should possess the following expertise:

- The team leader must have at least 10 years of experience including working with government projects / programmes, and with complex evaluations. He/she must be an expert in public policy, planning or M&E.
- The team members should have a background in social science studies, preferably, public policy, public administration, evaluation or social research with a minimum of 5 years' experience
- At least one member should be an institutional expert and experience in diagnostic and /or implementation evaluations
- The service provider must demonstrate commitment to capacity building through the incorporation of previously disadvantaged individuals and officials from DPME in the evaluation team.

### **5.2 A POTENTIAL STRUCTURE OF A GOOD PROPOSAL IS SHOWN IN BOX 1.**

#### **Box 1: Potential structure of a proposal**

The tenderer must provide the following. Failure to provide this will lead to a score of 1 on the score sheet, which results in disqualification.

- 1 Understanding of the TORs
- 2 Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation (e.g. literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of evaluation questions suggested, process elements)
- 3 Detailed activity-based evaluation plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities)
- 4 Activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT)
- 5 Background to the service provider including BBBE status and competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references)
- 6 Team (team members, expertise, roles and level of effort for each activity)
- 7 Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)
- 8 Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

#### **Attachments**

Example of a related evaluation report undertaken  
CVs of key personnel in the team  
Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance etc.

#### **5.2.1 Management Arrangements**

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Technical Working Group and an Evaluation Steering Committee.

#### **5.2.2 Role of Steering Committee**

A Steering Committee has been established comprising the DPME, National and Regional Department of Public Works, Defence & Military Veterans, Education, Environmental affairs, Energy, SAPS, Office of the Premier, Kagisano-Molopo Local Municipality, Dr. Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District Municipality, Water and Sanitation, Social Development, Eskom and Mineral Resources, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation, providing substantive guidance to the evaluation, and making key decisions including approving key reports i.e. the inception report; literature review, evaluation reports and other main deliverables prior to payments.

#### **5.2.3 Peer Reviewers**

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment. Two peer reviewers will be contracted to focus on both content and methodology of the assignment. The peer reviewers will provide their independent expert view on appropriate approaches, methods, instruments and data analysis as to ensure quality at the different stages of the assignment.

#### **5.2.4 Reporting Arrangements**

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The project manager for this project will be Mr Thabo Makhosane, Director; Special Projects to whom the service provider will report. The project will be commissioned by the DPME.

### **6. SPECIAL CONDITIONS**

#### **6.1 Evaluation criteria for proposals**

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors include:

- Quality of proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Team leaders' levels of expertise;
- Qualifications and expertise of the evaluation team;
- Inclusion of PDI members in the evaluation team who will gain experience.

#### **6.2 Evaluation of proposals**

There are three stages in selection – ensuring bids comply with administrative requirements, checking that functionally the proposal is adequate to do the job, and lastly the price is acceptable.

### **7. EVALUATION OF BIDS**

#### **7.1 FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION**

Mandatory requirements (if needed)

Weight allocation	Scoring system
1 – Value adding requirement (minimum score of 2)	1 – Does not comply with the requirements
3 – Important requirement (minimum score of 6)	2 – Partial compliance with requirements
5 – Essential requirement / integral part of project (minimum score of 15)	3 – Full compliance with requirements
	4 – Exceeds requirements

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X score	Minimum
1	The quality of the proposal	<b>Addressing the TORs</b> 1= The requirements of the evaluation not addressed at all. 2= Requirements of the evaluation partially addressed but not convincing. 3= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and convincingly. 4= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and additional value added	5			15
	The quality of the team	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				
	<b>OVERARCHING CONSIDERATIONS</b>					
2	Contextual knowledge and understanding	Understand the relevant sector/intervention and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments  1= Unconvincing that understand the sector/intervention 2= Some understanding of the sector but not deep 3= Good understanding of the sector and how implementation happens	3			6

## ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X score	Minimum
		4= Good understanding of the sector nationally and internationally, and can bring international insight				
	<b>EVALUATION LEADERSHIP</b>	Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in relation to the following three key role players				
3	Composition of team	<b>Project manager</b> has experience of managing successfully projects of this size previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Managed successfully <3 projects or of less than R1m 2= Managed successfully 1-2 projects of R1m and above 3= Managed successfully 3 projects of R1m and above 4= Managed successfully 3 evaluation or research projects of R1m and above	3			6
4		<b>Evaluation specialist</b> has experience of undertaking successfully evaluations of this size and nature previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Undertaken successfully <3 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Undertaken successfully 3-5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 and with knowledge of international best practice (convincing internationally as an evaluator in this type of work)	5			15
5		<b>Sector specialist</b> has deep knowledge of the sector 1= Worked in the sector for less than 3 years For all others a minimum of a master's degree plus: 2= Worked in the sector for 3-5 years and a reasonable understanding 3= Worked in the sector for 5-10 years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned 4= Worked in the sector for 10+ years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned as well as international good practice	3			6
6	PDI role in team	<b>At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)<sup>2</sup></b> and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation 1= Team consists of less than 40% PDIs and less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 2= Team consists of 40% PDIs but less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 3= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company) 4= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs, at least 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists above is PDI (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company)	3			6

<sup>2</sup> By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.



## ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X score	Minimum
7	Capacity development	<b>Capacity development</b> elements and building capacity of government partners, namely: 1= No indication of capacity development 2= Some capacity development included in proposal but not well thought through 3= Well thought through strategy of how they would use junior government staff on the evaluation 4= Interesting/innovative model for building capacity in evaluation of junior and potentially other government staff	3			6
	<b>EVALUATION CRAFT</b>					
8	Evaluative discipline and practice	<b>Demonstrated experience of undertaking quality evaluations (so using evaluation knowledge) relevant to the evaluation.</b> 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 (convincing as an evaluation organisation in this type of work)	3			6
9		Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries. 1= No international experience available 2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project 3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight 4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)	1			2
10	Research practice	<b>Demonstrated experience of systematically gathering, analysing, and synthesising relevant evidence,</b> data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and writing effective research reports. 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate knowledge of (qualitative or quantitative research)* <sup>3</sup> and are over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5	3			6

<sup>3</sup> Define the nature of research expertise needed depending on the type of evaluation  
Pomfret Evaluation (TOR) \_ 12 Oct 2016.doc

## ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X score	Minimum
		evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R1 000 000 (convincing as an organisation undertaking this type of research)				
	<b>DIAGNOSTIC / IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION</b>					
11	Evaluation planning	<b>Approach, design, methodology for the evaluation</b> 1= Not likely to address the needs of the evaluation 2= Some parts of the evaluation addressed satisfactorily but overall not convincing 3= Addresses these satisfactorily. Confident the evaluation can be implemented. 4= Addresses these satisfactorily. In addition some very interesting approaches suggested for undertaking the evaluation which are likely to increase the use	5			15
12		<b>Quality of activity-based plan</b> (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities) 1= No plan 2= Activity-based plan produced but not convincing that the methodology can be delivered using resources proposed 3= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology 4= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology, and innovative so that more can be delivered	3			6
13	Report writing and Communication	<b>Write clear, concise and focused reports</b> that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other 1= No examples of writing provided or examples show poor writing skills 2= Examples provided show adequate but not good writing skills, but use of evidence is not good 3= Examples provided show good reports which demonstrate use of evidence, good logic, and are well-written 4= Well-written and punchy reports with good use of infographics, good summaries, good use of evidence	3			6
	Total		43			

Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional evaluation criteria mentioned above.

### 8. GENERAL

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

### 9.1 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

DPME will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought in to the assignment or that is owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of DPME.

### 9.2 ENQUIRIES

## **ANNEXURE A – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

For **project content issues**, please contact Mr Thabo Makhosane, Director: Special Projects on 012 312 0126 / [ThaboMA@dpme.gov.za](mailto:ThaboMA@dpme.gov.za).







## **ANNEXURE E – TENDER DOCUMENTS**

All documentation included in and referred to in the tender documentation pack (SBDs, tax clearance certificate, B-BBEE certificate etc.) must be attached as Annexure E.