

COMPANY NAME:	ONDERSTEPOORT BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS
TENDER DESCRIPTION:	REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO CONDUCT A COMPREHENSIVE ORGANISATIONAL DESIGN PROJECT WHICH INCLUDES SKILLS AUDIT, JOB PROFILING, JOB GRADING AND PERFORM A MARKET BENCHMARKING FOR ALL THE POSITIONS AT ONDERSTEPOORT BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS. OBP03/26/HR01
COMPULSORY BRIEFING SESSION:	N/A
CLOSING DATE:	19 OCTOBER 2026
CLOSING TIME:	13H00
RESPONSES MUST BE HAND DELIVERED/COURIERED TO:	ONDERSTEPOORT BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS SOC LTD 100 OLD SOUTPAN ROAD, ONDERSTEPOORT PRETORIA NO FAXED OR E-MAILED BIDS WILL BE CONSIDERED
ATTENTION:	THE SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGER
N.B. ALL TENDERERS MUST ENSURE THAT THEY SIGN THE TENDER SUBMISSION REGISTER THAT WILL BE KEPT AT THE RECEPTION AREA AT OBP UPON SUBMISSION OF THEIR BID TAKE NOTE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT: ALL QUOTATIONS, PROPOSAL OR BIDS OF GOODS AND SERVICES ARE SUBJECT TO THE GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT JULY 2010.	

TENDERING STRUCTURE

Indicate the type of Bidding Structure by marking with an 'X':	
Individual Bidder	
Joint Venture	
Consortium	
Using sub-contractors	
Other	

If individual bidder, indicate the following:	
Name of bidder	
Registration Number	
VAT Registration Number (If applicable)	
Contact Person	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
E-mail address	
Postal Address	
Physical Address	

If Joint Venture/Consortium, indicate the following:	
Name of prime contractor	
Registration Number	
VAT Registration Number (If applicable)	
Contact Person	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
E-mail address	
Postal Address	
Physical Address	

If Joint Venture/Consortium, indicate the following: (To be completed for each JV/Consortium Member)	
Name of Joint Venture/Consortium	
Registration Number	
VAT Registration Number (If applicable)	
Contact Person	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
E-mail address	
Postal Address	
Physical Address	
If using subcontractors, indicate the following:	
Name of prime contractor	
Registration Number	
VAT Registration Number (If applicable)	
Contact Person	
Telephone Number	

ABREVIATIONS

• BBBEE	Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment
• OBP	Onderstepoort Biological Products
• RFB	Request for Bid
• ID	Identification Document
• AO/AA	Accounting Officer/ Accounting Authority
• DOA	Department of Agriculture
• SARB	Service Approval Review Board
• VAT	Value Added Tax
• SABS	South African Bureau of Standards
• NPA	National Prosecuting Authority
• SBD	Standard Bidding Document
• SHE	Safety Health and Environment
• EMO	Environmental Management Office
• OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
• NEM	National Environment Management
• EMU	Engineering Maintenance Unit
• COID	Compensation for Occupational Injuries and Diseases
• CSD	Central Supplier Data Base (National Treasury)
• ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning
• POD	Proof of Delivery
• GIT	Goods in Transit
• SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats
• RACI	Responsible Accountable Consulted Informed
• HR	Human Resource
• APP	Annual Performance Plan
• KPI's	Key Performance Indicators

Kindly Note that:

1. **Should all of these documents not be included, the bidder will be disqualified based on non-compliance.**
2. **The same documents must be submitted for all other companies that are involved in the tender case of a consortium.**

Checklist of compulsory documents to be submitted - Please tick in the relevant block below

YES	NO	Compulsory Documents
		One original and 3 copies of tender documents to be submitted at OBP Tender box.
		South African Companies should provide proof that the service provider is registered with CSD and must be tax compliant. Foreign /International companies must complete SBD1
		COID letter of good standing.
		Tax clearance certificate.
		Company Registration CIPC
		Proposed methodology and approach to the entire assignment.
		Proposed job evaluation and job grading methodology with justification for the methodology selected.
		Proposed approach to remuneration benchmarking and market competitiveness.
		Company profile indicating the number of years of relevant experience in organisational design, skills audit, job evaluation, job grading and remuneration benchmarking.
		Curriculum vitae of all proposed team members with defined roles
		Detailed pricing structure with milestone-based payment schedule.
		Not less than 5 Contactable reference letters from previous clients for comparable projects meeting the requirement below: • The letters must be on previous client's letter head; • Signed, contact details of client representative for verification; • Not older than 5 years; • The letters must be for similar projects; • The letters must comprise of projects completed in both the private and public sector; • And the letter must show the utilisation of the Paterson grading system.

Signed:**Name in Print:****Capacity:****Date:**

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR THIS TENDER

No	Contents	Page number
1	CONDITIONS AND UNDERTAKINGS BY TENDERER	6
2	TENDER CONDITIONS	8
3	SPECIFICATION	12
4	VALIDITY OF BID	27
5	PRICING SCHEDULE	27
6	DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY TENDERER SBD 4	29
7	PREFERENTIAL POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2017 SBD 6.1	32
8	DECLARATION OF INTEREST FOR PAST SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES SBD 8	37
9	CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT SBD 9	39

1. **CONDITIONS AND UNDERTAKINGS BY TENDERER**

- 1.1 **The Tender forms should not be retyped or redrafted, but photocopies may be prepared and used.** However, only documents with the original signature in black ink shall be accepted.
 - 1.1.1 Black ink should be used when completing Bid documents.
 - 1.1.2 Bidders should check the numbers of the pages to satisfy themselves that none is missing or duplicated. OBP will accept NO liability in regard to anything arising from the fact that the pages are missing or duplicated.
- 1.2 I/We hereby tender to supply all or any of the supplies and/or to procure all or any of the services described in the attached documents to OBP on the terms and conditions and in accordance with the specifications stipulated in the Tender documents (and which shall be taken as part of, and incorporated into, this Tender) at the prices inserted therein.
- 1.3 I/We agree that -
 - 1.3.1 The offer herein shall remain binding upon me/us and open for acceptance by OBP during the validity period indicated and calculated from the closing time and date of the Tender.
 - 1.3.2 the laws of the Republic of South Africa shall govern the contract created by the acceptance of my/our Tender and that I/we choose domicilium citandi et executandi in the Republic as indicated below; and
- 1.4 I/We furthermore confirm that I/we have satisfied myself/ourselves as to the correctness and validity of my/our Tender that the price(s) and rate(s) quoted cover all the work/item(s) specified in the Tender documents and that the price(s) and rate(s) cover all my/our obligations under a resulting contract and that I/we accept that any mistakes regarding price(s) and calculations will be at my/our risk.
- 1.5 I/We hereby accept full responsibility for the proper execution and fulfilment of all obligations and conditions devolving on me/us under this Tender as the Principal(s) liable for the due fulfilment of this contract.

Signature(s) of Tenderer or
assignee(s)

Date

Name of signing person (in block
letters)

Capacity

Are you duly authorized to sign this
Tenderer?

Name of Tenderer [company name] (in
block letters)

Postal address (in block letters)

Domicilium citandi et executandi in the RSA (full street address of this place) (in block letters)

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

Telephone Number: FAX Number.....

Cell Number.....

2. TENDER CONDITIONS

- 2.1 Tenderers shall provide full and accurate answers to all questions posed in this document and are required to explicitly state either "Comply" or "Not Comply" or "Partial" (with a Ö)" regarding compliance with the requirements. Where necessary, the tenderer shall substantiate their response to a specific question.
- 2.2 A "Ö" under "Accept" will be interpreted as full compliance/acceptance to the applicable paragraph. A "Ö" under "Accept" will be interpreted that the tenderer/s has/have read and understood the paragraph, but the tenderer does **not accept** the content of the applicable paragraph.
- 2.3 The following Tender conditions will govern the contract between the OBP and the successful tenderer:

Requirement	ACCEPT	NOT ACCEPT
2.3.1 Tenderers are invited to offer the Services/Products in accordance with the attached Specifications and the conditions within this document.		
2.3.2 Fully comprehensive service documentation shall be supplied in English by each Tenderer, which shall explicitly and detail, describe the service/s offered. This documentation should include sufficient detail to clearly give the reader a precise and unambiguous description of the service/s offered. Incomplete or incomprehensive service documentation will result in rejection of the offer.		
2.3.3 Tenderer's name and address should clearly appear on the outside of tender documents and on envelope.		
2.3.4 OBP reserves the right to evaluate and consider any Tenders that do not comply strictly to this RFP.		
2.3.5 Acceptance of any Tenders will only indicate, without any obligations on the part of either OBP and/or a Tenderer, the willingness of such parties to enter into negotiations, which may or may not result in a contract/order as the case may be.		
2.3.6		

OBP reserves the right to make a selection solely on the information received in the Tenders or to negotiate further with one or more Tenderer/s.		
2.3.7 The Tenderer/s selected for further negotiations, if any, will be chosen on the basis of the greatest benefit to OBP and not necessarily on the basis of the lowest price or any other criteria.		
2.3.8 Should OBP consider it necessary, the Tenderer/s shall agree to an inspection of the resources and works of the Tenderer, if so required?		
2.3.9 Should OBP consider it necessary, OBP will visit the Tenderer/s customer sites.		
2.3.10 OBP reserves the right: - to cancel this Request at any time. - not to accept any Tender. - to accept one or more Tenders for further negotiation and. - to contact any Tenderer during the evaluation period, to clarify information only, without informing any other Tenderer.		
2.3.11 The specifications, drawings, designs and all site plans are the intellectual property of OBP.		
2.3.12 The Procuring of the Services shall not take place until OBP has given final approval of all procedures.		
2.3.13 In the event that modifications, clarifications, or additions to the RFP become necessary, all Tenderers will be notified, in writing, addenda to this RFP.		
2.3.14 All costs incurred in the preparation, presentation and demonstration of the response shall be for the account of the Tenderer. All supporting documentation and manuals submitted with RFP will		

become OBP property unless otherwise stated by the Tenderer/s at the time of submission.		
2.3.15 Any material submitted by the Tenderer/s, which is confidential in nature, must be clearly marked as such.		
2.3.16 OBP will evaluate the bids against the following criteria: • Compliance to the Specifications • Compliance to Functionality • Price • BBBEE • Compliance to Bid Condition		
2.3.17 Payments of services rendered will be done 30 days after receipt of statement(s)		

2.4 REASONS FOR DISQUALIFICATION

- 2.4.1 OBP reserves the right to disqualify any Tenderer which does any one or more of the following, and such disqualification may take place without prior notice to the offending tenderer, however, the tenderer shall be notified in writing of such disqualification:
- Tenderers who are blacklisted.
 - Tenderers who are not registered on Central Supplier Database. / Not applicable to international companies
 - Tenderers who submitted incomplete information and documentation according to the requirements of this RFP.
 - Tenderers who submitted information that is fraudulent, factually untrue, or inaccurate, for example memberships that do not exist, BBBEE credentials, experience, etc.
 - Tenderers who received information not available to other vendors through fraudulent means.
 - Tenderers who in the past abused OBP's procurement system:
 - Tenderers who failed to perform on their previous contracts with OBP or any of their references
 - Tenderers that do not have the relevant Qualification will be disqualified.
- 2.4.2 No Tenders from any Tenderer with offices within the RSA shall be accepted if sent via Fax or e-mail. However, Tenders from international bidders with no office or representation in the RSA shall be accepted if received via the Fax or e-mail before the closing date and time. Such Tenders shall not be made available for evaluation until the original signed documentation is received within

three (3) working days after the closing date, otherwise the Bid shall be disqualified. International bidders must submit proof that they do not have any offices or representation in South Africa.

2.5 ENQUIRIES

Enquiries regarding this Request for Bid should be submitted via e-mail to:

Purchasing@obpvaccines.co.za Such queries must be sent at least **nine (9)** working days before the closing date. OBP cannot guarantee that queries received after that date will be answered before the Tender closing date.

3 SPECIFICATIONS

Introduction

Onderstepoort Biological Products (OBP) is a Schedule 3B Public Entity established in terms of the Onderstepoort Biological Products Incorporation Act 19 of 1999. Its primary objective is to create a favorable environment for the organization to build capacity in manufacturing technologies, infrastructure, and the development of new animal vaccine products to make profits.

Onderstepoort Biological Products (OBP) serves as a critical state-owned entity dedicated to safeguarding livestock and public health through comprehensive animal disease prevention, which directly protects food security, animal welfare, human health, and agricultural livelihoods. To achieve this, the organisation focuses on vaccine manufacturing by actively researching, developing, and producing cost-effective animal vaccines.

OBP has the following departments:

- Operations
- Human Resources
- Quality (Assurance and Control)
- Information and Communication Technology (ICT)
- Supply Chain
- Research and Development
- Sales and Marketing
- Finance

As a Schedule 3B public entity, the entity has 2 policy mandate roles, namely

- Public good – To ensure that the government's responsibility in terms of food security and safety is met through the development, security, and availability of critical vaccine reserves; and
- Private good – To ensure the ability of the entity to manufacture, distribute, and sell vaccines for financial gain.

Purpose

The purpose of this tender process is to engage a qualified service provider to conduct a comprehensive diagnostic of our current state, complete a skills audit, and design a future-state organizational structure that enhances operational effectiveness, clarifies accountabilities, and positions the organization for sustainable growth. Once the structure design is completed, a full benchmarking process will be undertaken to complete the assignment. The ultimate outcome will be a practical, implementable organizational design supported by a detailed transition roadmap that minimizes disruption while maximizing long-term value.

Scope Of Work

The service provider will be responsible for delivering a complete organizational design solution encompassing the following key work streams:

Diagnostic Phase

Current State Analysis:

- Review existing organizational documentation including strategic plans, operational policies, job descriptions, performance management system and organizational charts.
- Conduct confidential interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders including executive leadership, management, labour representatives, and union officials.
- Analyse current workflows, decision-making processes, reporting lines, and communication channels
- Review historical HR data including turnover rates, vacancy patterns, and recruitment challenges.
- Map current business processes to identify redundancies, bottlenecks, and inefficiencies.

Comprehensive Skills Audit:

- Update and validate all position descriptions to accurately reflect current duties and responsibilities.
- Develop and apply a standardized competency framework applicable across all roles and levels.
- Conduct individual skills assessments using appropriate methodologies (self-assessment, manager assessment, technical testing where applicable).
- Create a comprehensive skills inventory database capturing current workforce capabilities, qualifications, and experience levels.
- Benchmark identified skills against industry standards and comparable organizations.

Gap Analysis and Risk Assessment:

- Identify critical skill gaps between current workforce capabilities and projected organizational requirements.
- Conduct organizational capability analysis to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas requiring development.
- Complete a SWOT analysis examining organizational strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.
- Develop a comprehensive risk register identifying potential organizational design risks with corresponding mitigation strategies.
- Identify immediate opportunities for improvement and quick wins.

Design Phase

Future State Design:

- Develop a fit for purpose organizational structure with supporting rationale.
- Design optimal reporting lines, spans of control, and hierarchical levels.
- Create detailed position descriptions for all roles.
- Define accountability matrixes (RACI or similar) for key organizational functions and processes.
- Develop departmental and team structures with clear mandates and interfaces.

Job Profiling:

- Develop comprehensive job profiles for all positions within the approved organizational structure.
- Document key accountabilities, decision-making authority, and performance expectations for each role.
- Define essential qualifications, experience requirements, and technical competencies.
- Establish reporting relationships and position in organizational hierarchy.
- Create standardized job profile templates.

Job Evaluation and Grading:

- Apply a recognized job evaluation methodology.
- Evaluate all positions within the approved structure against consistent criteria including:
 - Knowledge and skills required
 - Problem-solving complexity
 - Accountability and decision-making authority
 - Working conditions and special requirements
 - Scope and impact of role
- Assign appropriate job grades/levels to all positions in accordance with the Patterson Grading System.
- Develop grade definitions and progression criteria.
- Ensure internal equity across comparable roles.

Market Benchmarking:

- Conduct comprehensive market benchmarking of all graded positions.
- Compare against relevant comparator organizations (size, sector, geographic scope).
- Analyse total remuneration packages including base salary, benefits, and variable pay.
- Identify positions above, below, or aligned with market median.
- Provide recommendations for remuneration adjustments where required including equal work equal pay.
- Benchmark against industry-specific salary surveys and recognized data sources.

Develop a performance management system

- Benchmark against industry-specific salary surveys and recognized data sources.
- Design a fit for purpose performance management system.
- Design a fit for purpose performance contracts linked to APP and Corporate Plan/Strategy.

Implementation Planning

Transition Roadmap:

- Develop a phased implementation timeline covering 3-6 months post-design approval.
- Identify resource requirements including budget, personnel, and time allocations.
- Prepare a comprehensive change management strategy tailored to organizational culture.
- Create a detailed communication plan for phased rollout to all stakeholder groups.
- Establish success metrics and KPIs to evaluate implementation effectiveness.

Transition Support:

- Develop role-matching methodology to transition current employees into new graded structure.
- Create transition frameworks for incumbents whose roles are graded differently.
- Develop communication materials explaining grading outcomes to staff.
- Provide recommendations for managing potential remuneration impacts.

Stakeholder Engagement Support

Consultation Facilitation:

- Prepare discussion materials and presentations for all OBP employees.
- Support HR in preparing board update presentations and materials.
- Facilitate employee feedback sessions as required during diagnostic and design phases.
- Develop Q&A documents and communication materials for distribution to all staff.

Project Deliverables

Current Organizational State Diagnostic Report

Skills Audit Report

Gap Analysis

Future Organizational Structure

Job Profiles

Job Evaluation and Grading

Salary Benchmarking

Performance Management Framework

Process Manual

Transition and Change Management Plan

Stakeholder Consultation Support

Monthly Status Update Meetings (virtual)

Final Integrated Organisation Design Report

On-site presentations to OBP employees – management/employee presentations

Project close-out report – summary of work done

Evaluation criteria

The request for this service will be evaluated based on the following stages.

Stage 1: Check for compulsory documents

All documents indicated on page 4 must be submitted, missing documents will result in automatic disqualification.

Stage 2: Company Experience

- The bidder must provide a company profile demonstrating at least ten (10) years of demonstrable experience in the delivery of services related to organisational design, skills audit, job evaluation and benchmarking.

- The bidder must provide at least five (5) contactable references from previous clients for projects of a similar nature and scope. Each reference letter must:
 1. Be issued on the previous client's official letterhead;
 2. Be signed by an authorised representative of the client;
 3. Have been issued within the past five (5) years;
 4. Clearly indicate the nature, scope and duration of services provided;
 5. Confirm that the bidder successfully delivered projects involving organisational design, skills audit, job evaluation, job grading, and remuneration benchmarking, and;
 6. Provide the name, designation, telephone number, and email address of a contactable client representative, and
- In addition to the reference letters, the bidder must submit a proposed comprehensive methodology and approach for the execution of the entire project. The proposed methodology must demonstrate the bidder's understanding of the requirements and clearly outline the approach, processes, tools, and techniques to be applied across all components of the project.

Stage 3 Evaluation for functionality

Interested service provider must obtain a minimum score of 80 for functionality to be eligible for evaluation in stage four. The following will be used as a criterion and the minimum points of each criterion which are indicated in the table below:

Aspect	Functionality Criteria	Weight	Means of Verification.
Proposed Methodology and Approach to the Project	Comprehensive methodology and approach covering the entire project; including organisational diagnostic, organisational design, skills audit, job analysis, job evaluation and grading Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No methodology provided	25 (Formula: Score X5)	Assessment of the submitted methodology, and project approach, including clarity, comprehensiveness, logical sequencing, understanding of requirements, stakeholder engagement, deliverables, project timelines, risk management and practicality of the proposed approach

	• 1 point = Poor : Incomplete, generic, significant requirement not addressed; little evidence of understanding of the assignment. • 2 points = Below expectation: Significant gaps; unclear approach, lacks practical application; limited stakeholder engagement and implementation detail. • 3 points = Good / Acceptable Meets basic requirements but lacks detail or originality; some areas require clarification. • 4 points = Very Good: Comprehensive methodology, addresses all key requirements, clear approach, practical methodology, minor gaps only. • 5 points = Excellent: Exceptional clarity and innovation; clearly and fully tailored methodology to our organisation; comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan; realistic timeline; strong risk mitigation; demonstrates deep understanding of our context.		Detailed Verification Criteria: Score 0: completely omitted or non-responsive Score 1: Generic copy-paste text; missing 2+ core scope components (e.g. skills audit or job analysis entirely); or no execution logic. Score 2: Touches on all areas superficially; lacks practical execution steps; no clear stakeholder engagement strategy or implementation plan. Score 3: Standard linear methodology covering all 6 phases (Diagnostic, Design, Skills Audit, Job Analysis, Evaluation, Grading); standard project plan provided'; minor operational details need clarification. Score 4: Robust end to end framework showing clear phase-to-phase dependencies; validated diagnostic/audit tools named; clear deliverables, timeline and quality assurance controls included.
--	--	--	--

			Score 5: Fully customised to the specific state-owned/veterinary/manufacturing content; detailed stakeholder engagement matrix with proactive mitigations; innovative execution techniques; realistic milestone schedule.
Job Evaluation and Job Grading Methodology	Proposed job evaluation and grading methodology, including justification for the selected approach. The bidder must demonstrate how jobs will be analysed, evaluated and graded objectively and consistently; including factors to be applied, governance, management of appeals and disputes and alignment with internal equity. The approach must be suitable for a unionised environment and capable of producing transparent outcomes. Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No job evaluation system proposed • 1 point (Poor) = Methodology is inadequate; unsupported; limited understanding of job evaluation principles. • 2 points (Below expectation) = Methodology is unclear; limited	20 (Formula: Score X4)	Assessment of the proposed job evaluation and grading methodology; evidence of the methodology's credibility and application in comparable organisations, assessment of justification, transparency, objectivity, consistency, and suitability for OBP. Detailed Verification Criteria: Score 0: No job evaluation system proposed. • Score 1 (Poor): Mentions evaluation without naming or defining an objective system or factor evaluation model; no rationale provided. • 2 (Below expectation): Names a recognized system (e.g., Paterson, Peromnes, Hay) but fails to explain how factors are scored, how internal equity is

	justification and practical application. • 3 points (Good/Acceptable) = Acceptable methodology with adequate justification, but limited detail in some areas. • 4 points (Very Good) = Robust methodology with clear rationale; most elements covered; minor gaps only. • 5 points (Excellent) = Highly robust, objective and defensible methodology, strong justification; clear evaluation and grading framework, comprehensive governance, validation and demonstrated suitability for a unionised environment and comparable assignments.		maintained, or how appeals are managed. • 3 (Good/Acceptable): Fully names and justifies a standard, recognized evaluation system; includes basic appeal mechanisms and objective factor weightings; lacks deep union context. • 4 (Very Good): Defensible methodology with clear evaluation factors, transparent grading structures, clear appeal/governance workflows, and proven application in unionized environments. • 5 (Excellent): Exceptionally objective, defensible, and transparent system; detailed union-alignment strategy (e.g., joint evaluation committees, dispute protocols); clear internal equity mapping; proven track record in state-owned enterprise (SOE) environments.
Remuneration Benchmarking and Market Competitiveness	Market benchmarking methodology and approach; including proposed market data sources, selection of comparator organisations/jobs, treatment of job	15 (Formula: Score X3)	Assessment of proposed market data sources; benchmarking methodology, comparator selection, job matching approach, market

	matching, market positioning, analysis of remuneration data and approach to addressing scarce/critical skills. The bidder must demonstrate how external competitiveness will be assessed while maintaining internal equity. Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No benchmarking methodology provided • 1 point (Poor): No data sources; irrelevant organisation comparators. • 2 points (Below expectation): Limited or questionable data sources; poor relevance; unclear application methodology. • 3 points (Good / Acceptable): Adequate but limited data sources; some relevance concerns; approach lacks detail. • 4 points (Very Good): Credible data sources; relevant comparators; clear approach; minor gaps only.	positioning, and treatment of market data limitations. Detailed Verification Criteria: • Score 0: Omitted. • 1 (Poor): Outdated, informal, or non-reputable data sources; no job matching methodology or positioning logic. • 2 (Below expectation): Relies on a single, generic survey; weak comparator peer group selection criteria; vague approach to scarce skills or market positioning. • 3 (Good/Acceptable): Cites reputable, recognized salary surveys; outlines clear peer-group selection criteria; provides standard job matching percentages (e.g., 80% content match). • 4 (Very Good): Utilizes multiple reputable national/sector salary databases; robust methodology for scarce/critical skill premium mapping; clear market
--	---	---

	• 5 points (Excellent): Multiple credible data sources; highly relevant comparators; clear methodology for application; well justified comparator organisations, transparent about limitations; strong understanding of the relevant sector.		positioning framework (percentiles/medians). • 5 (Excellent): Leverages multiple highly relevant national and specialized industry databases (e.g., pharma, biotech, agriculture, SOEs); rigorous job matching and data normalization mechanics; explicit strategy for balancing external competitiveness against internal grade equity.
Relevant Experience and Track Record	Demonstrated experience in delivering comparable assignments, particularly organisational design, skills audits, job evaluation, job grading and remuneration benchmarking. Experience must demonstrate similarity in terms of organisational complexity, scope and operating environment. Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No relevant experience/references provided. • 1 point (Poor): Limited or largely unrelated experience; insufficient evidence of successful delivery.	15 (Formula: Score X3)	Company profile and project experience; minimum five (5) contactable reference letters from comparable projects, issued within the past five years, on client letterhead and signed by an authorised representative; contact details of client representative for verification. Detailed Verification Criteria: • Score 0: No profile, experience, or reference letters submitted. • 1 (Poor): 1–2 references; projects unaligned in scope

	• 2 points (Below expectation): Some relevant experience, but limited scale, scope or complexity. • 3 points (Good / Acceptable): Demonstrated experience on comparable assignments with satisfactory evidence. • 4 points (Very Good): Strong track record on several comparable assignments, including relevant organisational design, skills audit, job evaluation/grading and benchmarking experience. • 5 points (Excellent): Extensive and highly relevant track record on complex, comparable assignments; strong evidence of successful delivery across the major components of the assignment and excellent client references		(e.g., basic recruitment) or completed >5 years ago. • 2 (Below expectation): 3–4 reference letters, or projects covering only 1–2 aspects of the required scope; limited organizational complexity. • 3 (Good/Acceptable): Exactly 5 valid signed reference letters on letterhead for projects of comparable scope within the last 5 years. • 4 (Very Good): 5+ signed reference letters demonstrating successful delivery across all key components (OD, skills audit, job evaluation, benchmarking) in medium-to-large entities. • 5 (Excellent): 5+ impeccable reference letters from complex, highly regulated, or unionized state-owned/manufacturing/scientific entities; outstanding verified performance across all scope pillars.
--	---	--	--

Project Team and Execution Capacity	Qualifications, experience and capability of the proposed project team, including clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The team should demonstrate appropriate expertise across organisational design, skills auditing, job evaluation/grading, remuneration benchmarking, project management and stakeholder engagement. Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No Cv's or team structure provided. • 1 point (Poor): Team lacks relevant qualifications/experience; roles unclear. • 2 points (Below expectation): Team demonstrates limited relevant experience or has gaps in key competencies. • 3 points (Good / Acceptable): Adequate team with relevant experience, but some gaps in specialist expertise. • 4 points (Very Good): Strong team with relevant qualification and	15 (Formula: Score X3)	CV's of all proposed team members; qualifications and relevant professional certifications where applicable; defined roles and responsibilities; evidence of experience on comparable assignments; project governance structure and continuity/contingency arrangements. Detailed Verification Criteria: • Score 0: Omitted. • 1 (Poor): CVs missing; generic personnel with unaligned qualifications or under 2 years of relevant experience. • 2 (Below expectation): Basic team provided; key specialist roles missing (e.g., missing a dedicated Job Evaluation or Change Management lead); unclear organogram. • 3 (Good/Acceptable): Complete team with relevant degree qualifications, 3–5 years of experience, clear role assignments, and basic project governance.
-------------------------------------	--	---	--

	experience; clearly defined roles; appropriate balance of expertise. • 5 points (Excellent): Highly experienced multidisciplinary team with extensive direct experience on comparable assignments; clearly defined responsibilities; strong specialist expertise; appropriate leadership; robust continuity and contingency arrangements		• 4 (Very Good): Multidisciplinary team with advanced degrees/certifications (e.g., GRP, SARA, PMI/PMP), 5–8+ years of specialized experience per lead, and a clear matrix structure. • 5 (Excellent): Senior expert team (10+ years direct experience) with specialized professional accreditations; clear leadership and governance structure; explicit succession/contingency plans for key personnel replacement.
Value for money – pricing structure	Detailed pricing structure with milestone-based payment schedule Scoring Scale (0 to 5): • 0 points = No submission. • 1 point (Poor): Vague; incomplete; no clear payment schedule. • 2 points (Below expectation): Limited detail; unclear milestones; cost breakdown insufficient.	10 (Formula: Score X2)	Review of cost breakdown; assessment of transparency, milestone alignment, and payment schedule reasonableness Detailed Verification Criteria: • Score 0: No financial/pricing breakdown provided. • 1 (Poor): Single lump-sum figure with no cost drivers, activity breakdown, or milestone schedule. • 2 (Below expectation): High-level breakdown without clear

	• 3 points (Good / Acceptable): Adequate but lacks some detail; payment schedule not fully clear. • 4 points (Very Good): Good detail and structure; clear milestones; minor concerns on some elements. • 5 points (Excellent): Transparent and detailed; logical milestone-based payment schedule; fair and competitive; clear breakdown of all costs; strong value proposition		linkage to deliverables; upfront heavy payment requests without completed outputs. • 3 (Good/Acceptable): Cost broken down by main phases; basic payment schedule tied to key deliverables; minor gaps in disbursements/out-of-pocket definitions. • 4 (Very Good): Detailed itemization (hourly rates, resource allocation per phase, disbursements); payment strictly tied to verifiable milestone sign-offs. • 5 (Excellent): Fully transparent, comprehensive cost breakdown by phase, task, and role-hour; zero hidden costs; highly logical milestone payment structure tied to strict quality acceptance criteria; clear value proposition.
Total		100	

Bidders that meet the functionality criteria will move to the next stage

Stage 4: Price and BBEE

The evaluation for Price and **BBEE** shall be based on the **80/20** PPPFA principle and the points for evaluation criteria are as follows:

Evaluation of Price and Preference

All Bids will be evaluated on a points system based on weighted average score for Price and Preference as per Preferential Procurement Framework Act of 2000 (Act 5 of 2000).

Preference Point allocation – 80/20	
Price / Preference	Weighting percentage
Preference:	20%
Price:	80 %
Total must equal:	100%

Specific Goals / B-BBEE Contributor Level	Points (80/20 System) From R1million up to R50 million	Required Evidence	Yes/No
Level 1 Contributor	12 Points	Valid B-BBEE Certificate / Sworn Affidavit	
Level 2 Contributor	8 Points		
Level 3 to 8 Contributor	4 Points		
Entities Owned by Black Women (≥51%)	4 Points	Valid B-BBEE Certificate / Sworn Affidavit	
Enterprise Development Targeted Commodities (Consumables, laboratory PPE, packaging, and non-active chemical blending)	4 Points	CIPC registration showing majority local ownership 51% South African)	
TOTAL GOAL POINTS	20 Points		

Specific goals are tailored to accelerate transformation in the biological and pharmaceutical science sectors while supporting local infrastructure.

The evaluation for Price and BBBEE shall be based on the **80/20** PPPFA principle and the points for evaluation criteria are as follows:

Evaluation Criteria		Points
1.	Price	80
2.	Specific goals	20
3.	Total	100

4.VALIDITY OF BIDS

The prospective tenderer is required to confirm that it will hold its Bid valid for 120 Days from the closing date of the submission of Bids. All the Bids must be quoted in South African Rand and remain valid for 120 days after closure of the tender.

5.PRICING SCHEDULE

Item	Cost (excl. VAT)
Diagnostic phase	
Design phase	
Implementation phase	
Review of performance management system	
Implementation planning	
Stakeholder engagement support	
Other	
Total:	
VAT 15%	
Total, incl. VAT	

Presentation of proposal

A recommended bidder that meets all the above evaluation criterion will undergo a presentation of proposal at OBP Premises (at own expense/s) communication will be shared accordingly.

Signed

Name in Print:

Capacity:

Date:

6. DECLARATION OF INTEREST BY TENDERER SBD4

BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE

1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

Any person (natural or juristic) may make an offer or offers in terms of this invitation to bid. In line with the principles of transparency, accountability, impartiality, and ethics as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and further expressed in various pieces of legislation, it is required for the bidder to make this declaration in respect of the details required hereunder.

Where a person/s are listed in the Register for Tender Defaulters and / or the List of Restricted Suppliers, that person will automatically be disqualified from the bid process.

2. Bidder's declaration

2.1 Is the bidder, or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest¹ in the enterprise,

employed by the state?

YES/NO

2.1.1 If so, furnish particulars of the names, individual identity numbers, and, if applicable, state employee numbers of sole proprietor/ directors / trustees / shareholders / members/ partners or any person having a controlling interest in the enterprise, in table below.

Full Name	Identity Number	Name of State institution

¹ the power, by one person or a group of persons holding the majority of the equity of an enterprise, alternatively, the person/s having the deciding vote or power to influence or to direct the course and decisions of the enterprise.

2.2 Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have a relationship with any person who is employed by the procuring institution? **YES/NO**

2.2.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

2.3 Does the bidder or any of its directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners or any person having a controlling interest in the enterprise have any interest in any other related enterprise whether or not they are bidding for this contract? **YES/NO**

2.3.1 If so, furnish particulars:

.....

3 DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, (name)..... in submitting the accompanying bid, do hereby make the following statements that I certify to be true and complete in every respect:

- 3.1 I have read, and I understand the contents of this disclosure.
- 3.2 I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this disclosure is found not to be true and complete in every aspect.
- 3.3 The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor. However, communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium² will not be construed as collusive bidding.
- 3.4 In addition, there have been no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications, prices, including methods, factors or formulas used to calculate prices, market allocation, the intention or decision to submit or not to submit the bid, bidding with the intention not to win the bid and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
- 3.4 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.

² Joint venture or Consortium means an association of persons for the purpose of combining their expertise, property, capital, efforts, skill and knowledge in an activity for the execution of a contract.

- 3.5 There have been no consultations, communications, agreements, or arrangements made by the bidder with any official of the procuring institution in relation to this procurement process prior to and during the bidding process except to provide clarification on the bid submitted where so required by the institution; and the bidder was not involved in the drafting of the specifications or terms of reference for this bid.
- 3.6 I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms of section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED IN PARAGRAPHS 1, 2 and 3 ABOVE IS CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT THE STATE MAY REJECT THE BID OR ACT AGAINST ME IN TERMS OF PARAGRAPH 6 OF PFMA SCM INSTRUCTION 03 OF 2021/22 ON PREVENTING AND COMBATING ABUSE IN THE SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

.....

Signature

Date

.....

Position

Name of bidder

7. PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2022 SBD 6.1

This preference form must form part of all tenders invited. It contains general information and serves as a claim form for preference points for specific goals.

NB: BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM, TENDERERS MUST STUDY THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, DEFINITIONS AND DIRECTIVES APPLICABLE IN RESPECT OF THE TENDER AND PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2022

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

1.1 The following preference point systems are applicable to invitations to tender:

- the 80/20 system for requirements with a Rand value of up to R50 000 000 (all applicable taxes included); and
- the 90/10 system for requirements with a Rand value above R50 000 000 (all applicable taxes included).

1.2 To be completed by the organ of state

(delete whichever is not applicable for this tender).

- a) The applicable preference point system for this tender is the **90/10** preference point system.
- b) The applicable preference point system for this tender is the **80/20** preference point system.
- c) Either the **90/10 or 80/20 preference point system** will be applicable in this tender. The lowest/highest acceptable tender will be used to determine the accurate system once tenders are received.

1.3 Points for this tender (even in the case of a tender for income-generating contracts) shall be awarded for:

- (a) Price; and
- (b) Specific Goals.

1.4 To be completed by the organ of state:

The maximum points for this tender are allocated as follows:

	POINTS
PRICE	80
SPECIFIC GOALS	20
Total points for Price and SPECIFIC GOALS	100

1.5 Failure on the part of a tenderer to submit proof or documentation required in terms of this tender to claim points for specific goals with the tender, will be interpreted to mean that preference points for specific goals are not claimed.

1.6 The organ of state reserves the right to require of a tenderer, either before a tender is adjudicated or at any time subsequently, to substantiate any claim in regard to preferences, in any manner required

by the organ of state.

2. DEFINITIONS

- (a) **“tender”** means a written offer in the form determined by an organ of state in response to an invitation to provide goods or services through price quotations, competitive tendering process or any other method envisaged in legislation;
- (b) **“price”** means an amount of money tendered for goods or services, and includes all applicable taxes less all unconditional discounts;
- (c) **“Rand value”** means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand, calculated at the time of bid invitation, and includes all applicable taxes;
- (d) **“tender for income-generating contracts”** means a written offer in the form determined by an organ of state in response to an invitation for the origination of income-generating contracts through any method envisaged in legislation that will result in a legal agreement between the organ of state and a third party that produces revenue for the organ of state, and includes, but is not limited to, leasing and disposal of assets and concession contracts, excluding direct sales and disposal of assets through public auctions; and
- (e) **“The Act”** means the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act, 2000 (Act No. 5 of 2000).

3. FORMULAE FOR PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES

3.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

3.1.1 THE 80/20 OR 90/10 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS

A maximum of 80 or 90 points is allocated for price on the following basis:

80/20	or	90/10
$Ps = 80 \left(1 - \frac{Pt - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right)$	or	$Ps = 90 \left(1 - \frac{Pt - P_{min}}{P_{min}} \right)$

Where:

- Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
- Pt = Price of tender under consideration
- Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

3.2. FORMULAE FOR DISPOSAL OR LEASING OF STATE ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING PROCUREMENT

3.2.1. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

A maximum of 80 or 90 points is allocated for price on the following basis:

80/20	or	90/10
$Ps = 80 \left(1 + \frac{Pt - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right)$	or	$Ps = 90 \left(1 + \frac{Pt - P_{max}}{P_{max}} \right)$

Where:

- Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration
- Pt = Price of tender under consideration
- Pmax = Price of highest acceptable tender

4. POINTS AWARDED FOR SPECIFIC GOALS

- 4.1. In terms of Regulation 4(2); 5(2); 6(2) and 7(2) of the Preferential Procurement Regulations, preference points must be awarded for specific goals stated in the tender. For the purposes of this tender the tenderer will be allocated points based on the goals stated in table 1 below as may be supported by proof/ documentation stated in the conditions of this tender:
- 4.2. In cases where organs of state intend to use Regulation 3(2) of the Regulations, which states that, if it is unclear whether the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system applies, an organ of state must, in the tender documents, stipulate in the case of—
- (a) an invitation for tender for income-generating contracts, that either the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system will apply and that the highest acceptable tender will be used to determine the applicable preference point system; or
 - (b) any other invitation for tender, that either the 80/20 or 90/10 preference point system will apply and that the lowest acceptable tender will be used to determine the applicable preference point system,
- then the organ of state must indicate the points allocated for specific goals for both the 90/10 and 80/20 preference point system.

Table 1: Specific goals for the tender and points claimed are indicated per the table below.

(Note to organs of state: Where either the 90/10 or 80/20 preference point system is applicable, corresponding points must also be indicated as such.

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

The specific goals allocated points in terms of this tender	Number of points allocated (90/10 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points allocated (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points claimed (90/10 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
Level 1 Contributor		12		
Level 2 Contributor		8		
Level 3 to 8 Contributor		4		
Entities own by Black Women (>51%)		4		
Enterprise Development Targeted Commodities (Consumables, laboratory PPE, packaging and non-active chemical blending)		4		
TOTAL GOAL POINTS		20 POINTS		

DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO COMPANY/FIRM

4.3. Name of company/firm.....

4.4. Company registration number:

4.5. TYPE OF COMPANY/ FIRM

- ☐ Partnership/Joint Venture / Consortium
- ☐ One-person business/sole propriety
- ☐ Close corporation
- ☐ Public Company
- ☐ Personal Liability Company
- ☐ (Pty) Limited
- ☐ Non-Profit Company
- ☐ State Owned Company

[TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

4.6. I, the undersigned, who is duly authorised to do so on behalf of the company/firm, certify that the points claimed, based on the specific goals as advised in the tender, qualifies the company/ firm for the preference(s) shown and I acknowledge that:

- i) The information furnished is true and correct;
- ii) The preference points claimed are in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in

paragraph 1 of this form;

- iii) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraphs 1.4 and 4.2, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the organ of state that the claims are correct;
- iv) If the specific goals have been claimed or obtained on a fraudulent basis or any of the conditions of contract have not been fulfilled, the organ of state may, in addition to any other remedy it may have –
 - (a) disqualify the person from the tendering process;
 - (b) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person's conduct;
 - (c) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;
 - (d) recommend that the tenderer or contractor, its shareholders and directors, or only the shareholders and directors who acted on a fraudulent basis, be restricted from obtaining business from any organ of state for a period not exceeding 10 years, after the *audi alteram partem* (hear the other side) rule has been applied; and
 - (e) forward the matter for criminal prosecution, if deemed necessary.

..... SIGNATURE(S) OF TENDERER(S)	
SURNAME AND NAME:	
DATE:	
ADDRESS:	
	
	
	

8. DECLARATION OF INTEREST FOR PAST SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES SBD 8

- 1 This Standard Bidding Document must form part of all bids invited.
- 2 It serves as a declaration to be used by institutions in ensuring that when goods and services are being procured, all reasonable steps are taken to combat the abuse of the supply chain management system.
- 3 The bid of any bidder may be disregarded if that bidder, or any of its directors have-
 - a. abused the institution's supply chain management system.
 - b. committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system; or
 - c. failed to perform on any previous contract.
- 4 **In order to give effect to the above, the following questionnaire must be completed and submitted with the bid.**

Item	Question	Yes	No
4.1	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the National Treasury's Database of Restricted Suppliers as companies or persons prohibited from doing business with the public sector? (Companies or persons who are listed on this Database were informed in writing of this restriction by the Accounting Officer/Authority of the institution that imposed the restriction after the <i>audi alteram partem</i> rule was applied). The Database of Restricted Suppliers now resides on the National Treasury's website(www.treasury.gov.za) and can be accessed by clicking on its link at the bottom of the home page.	Yes ☐	No ☐
4.1.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.2	Is the bidder or any of its directors listed on the Register for Tender Defaulters in terms of section 29 of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act (No 12 of 2004)? The Register for Tender Defaulters can be accessed on the National Treasury's website (www.treasury.gov.za) by clicking on its link at the bottom of the home page.	Yes ☐	No ☐
4.2.1	If so, furnish particulars:		
4.3	Was the bidder or any of its directors convicted by a court of law (including a court outside of the Republic of South Africa) for fraud or corruption during the past five years?	Yes ☐	No ☐
4.3.1	If so, furnish particulars:		

4.4	Was any contract between the bidder and any organ of state terminated during the past five years on account of failure to perform on or comply with the contract?	Yes ☐	No ☐
4.4.1	If so, furnish particulars:		

SBD 8

CERTIFICATION

I, THE UNDERSIGNED (FULL NAME)
 CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION FURNISHED ON THIS DECLARATION FORM IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT, IN ADDITION TO CANCELLATION OF A CONTRACT, ACTION MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST ME SHOULD THIS DECLARATION PROVE TO BE FALSE.

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Position

.....
Name of Bidder

9: CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION SBD 9

- 1 This Standard Bidding Document (SBD) must form part of all bids¹ invited.
- 2 Section 4 (1) (b) (iii) of the Competition Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended, prohibits an agreement between, or concerted practice by, firms, or a decision by an association of firms if it is between parties in a horizontal relationship and if it involves collusive bidding (or bid rigging). ² Collusive bidding is a *pe se* prohibition meaning that it cannot be justified under any grounds.
- 3 Treasury Regulation 16A9 prescribes that accounting officers and accounting authorities must take all reasonable steps to prevent abuse of the supply chain management system and authorizes accounting officers and accounting authorities to:
 - a. disregards the bid of any bidder if that bidder, or any of its directors have abused the institution's supply chain management system and or committed fraud or any other improper conduct in relation to such system.
 - b. cancels a contract awarded to a supplier of goods and services if the supplier committed any corrupt or fraudulent act during the bidding process or the execution of that contract.
- 4 This SBD serves as a certificate of declaration that would be used by institutions to ensure that, when bids are considered, reasonable steps are taken to prevent any form of bid-rigging.
- 5 In order to give effect to the above, the attached Certificate of Bid Determination (SBD 9) must be completed and submitted with the bid:

¹ Includes price quotations, advertised competitive bids, limited bids and Bids.

² Bid rigging (or collusive bidding) occurs when businesses, that would otherwise be expected to compete, secretly conspire to raise prices, or lower the quality of goods and / or services for purchasers who wish to acquire goods and / or services through a bidding process. Bid rigging is, therefore, an agreement between competitors not to compete.

CERTIFICATE OF INDEPENDENT BID DETERMINATION (SBD 9)

I, the undersigned, in submitting the accompanying bid:

(Bid Number and Description)

in response to the invitation for the bid made by:

(Name of Institution)

do hereby make the following statements that I certify to be true and complete in every respect:

I certify, on behalf of: _____ that:

(Name of Bidder)

1. I have read and I understand the contents of this Certificate.

2. I understand that the accompanying bid will be disqualified if this Certificate is found not to be true and complete in every respect.
3. I am authorized by the bidder to sign this Certificate, and to submit the accompanying bid, on behalf of the bidder.
4. Each person whose signature appears on the accompanying bid has BBBEE authorized by the bidder to determine the terms of, and to sign the bid, on behalf of the bidder.
5. For the purposes of this Certificate and the accompanying bid, I understand that the word "competitor" shall include any individual or organization, other than the bidder, whether or not affiliated with the bidder, who:
 - (a) has BBBEE requested to submit a bid in response to this bid invitation.
 - (b) could potentially submit a bid in response to this bid invitation, based on their qualifications, abilities, or experience; and
 - (c) provides the same goods and services as the bidder and/or is in the same line of business as the bidder
6. The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement, or arrangement with any competitor. However, communication between partners in a joint venture or consortium³ will not be construed as collusive bidding.
7. In particular, without limiting the generality of paragraphs 6 above, there has BBBEE no consultation, communication, agreement, or arrangement with any competitor regarding:
 - (a) prices.
 - (b) geographical area where product or service will be rendered (market allocation)
 - (c) methods, factors, or formulas used to calculate prices.
 - (d) the intention or decision to submit or not to submit, a bid.
 - (e) the submission of a bid which does not meet the specifications and conditions of the bid; or
 - (f) bidding with the intention not to win the bid.
8. In addition, there have BBBEE no consultations, communications, agreements or arrangements with any competitor regarding the quality, quantity, specifications and conditions or delivery particulars of the products or services to which this bid invitation relates.
9. The terms of the accompanying bid have not BBBEE, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.

³ Joint venture or Consortium means an association of persons for the purpose of combining their expertise, property, capital, efforts, skill and knowledge in an activity for the execution of a contract.

10. I am aware that, in addition and without prejudice to any other remedy provided to combat any restrictive practices related to bids and contracts, bids that are suspicious will be reported to the Competition Commission for investigation and possible imposition of administrative penalties in terms

of section 59 of the Competition Act No 89 of 1998 and or may be reported to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the public sector for a period not exceeding ten (10) years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act No 12 of 2004 or any other applicable legislation.

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Position

.....
Name of Bidder