MHSC
Mine Health and Safety Council

Established in terms of Section 41(1) of the Mine Health and Safety Act, 1996 (Act 29 of 1996)
Western Woods Office Park, 145 Western Service Road, B7 Maple Place, Woodmead
Tel. No. (011) 656 1797 I Fax: (011) 656 1796

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ)

APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO DEVELOP AND PILOT A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT OF THE MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY COUNCIL'S RESEARCH, LEGISLATIVE AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIO IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN MINING INDUSTRY

RFQ NUMBER: 2665c

CLOSING DATE AND TIME: 16 November 2026 @ 11:00am

BID DOCUMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY TO THE FOLLOWING EMAIL ADDRESS:
ebids@mhsc.org.za **NB:** Only bid documents submitted via the designated email above will be accepted.

Enquiries: Any clarification required by a bidder regarding the meaning or interpretation of the document or any aspect concerning the submission is to be requested in writing from: **Supply Chain Management** – MHSC: **ebids@mhsc.org.za**

SBD 1

MHSC
Mine Health and Safety Council

1. PART F: STANDARD BIDDING DOCUMENTS

PART A
INVITATION TO BID

YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO BID FOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINE HEALTH SAFETY COUNCIL					
BID NUMBER:	2665c	**CLOSING DATE:**	16 November 2026	**CLOSING TIME:**	11:00am
DESCRIPTION	**APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO DEVELOP AND PILOT A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT OF THE MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY COUNCIL'S RESEARCH, LEGISLATIVE AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PORTFOLIO IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN MINING INDUSTRY**				
BID RESPONSE DOCUMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE DESIGNATED EMAIL ADDRESS BELOW					
ebids@mhsc.org.za					

BIDDING PROCEDURE ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO		**TECHNICAL ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:**	
CONTACT PERSON	**SCM**	CONTACT PERSON	**SCM**
TELEPHONE NUMBER	**N/A**	TELEPHONE NUMBER	**N/A**
FACSIMILE NUMBER	**N/A**	FACSIMILE NUMBER	**N/A**
E-MAIL ADDRESS	ebids@mhsc.org.za	E-MAIL ADDRESS	ebids@mhsc.org.za

SUPPLIER INFORMATION				
NAME OF BIDDER				
POSTAL ADDRESS				
STREET ADDRESS				
TELEPHONE NUMBER	CODE		NUMBER	
CELLPHONE NUMBER				
FACSIMILE NUMBER	CODE		NUMBER	
E-MAIL ADDRESS				

VAT REGISTRATION NUMBER					
SUPPLIER COMPLIANCE STATUS	TAX COMPLIANCE SYSTEM PIN:		**OR**	CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE No:	**MAAA**
ARE YOU THE ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA FOR THE GOODS /SERVICES OFFERED?	☐Yes ☐No [IF YES ENCLOSE PROOF]		*ARE YOU A FOREIGN BASED SUPPLIER FOR THE GOODS /SERVICES OFFERED?*	☐Yes ☐No [IF YES, ANSWER THE QUESTIONNAIRE BELOW]	

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BIDDING FOREIGN SUPPLIERS

IS THE ENTITY A RESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA (RSA)?
☐ YES ☐ NO

DOES THE ENTITY HAVE A BRANCH IN THE RSA?
☐ YES ☐ NO

DOES THE ENTITY HAVE A PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT IN THE RSA?
☐ YES ☐ NO

DOES THE ENTITY HAVE ANY SOURCE OF INCOME IN THE RSA?
☐ YES ☐ NO

IS THE ENTITY LIABLE IN THE RSA FOR ANY FORM OF TAXATION?
☐ YES ☐ NO

IF THE ANSWER IS "NO" TO ALL OF THE ABOVE, THEN IT IS NOT A REQUIREMENT TO REGISTER FOR A TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS SYSTEM PIN CODE FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVENUE SERVICE (SARS) AND IF NOT REGISTER AS PER 2.3 BELOW.

PART B
TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR BIDDING

1. BID SUBMISSION:
1.1. BIDS MUST BE DELIVERED BY THE STIPULATED TIME TO THE CORRECT ADDRESS. LATE BIDS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED FOR CONSIDERATION.
1.2. **ALL BIDS MUST BE SUBMITTED ON THE OFFICIAL FORMS PROVIDED (NOT TO BE RE-TYPED) OR IN THE MANNER PRESCRIBED IN THE BID DOCUMENT.**
1.3. THIS BID IS SUBJECT TO THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK ACT, 2000 AND THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, THE GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT (GCC) AND, IF APPLICABLE, ANY OTHER SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT.
1.4. **THE SUCCESSFUL BIDDER WILL BE REQUIRED, WHERE APPLICABLE TO FILL IN AND SIGN A WRITTEN CONTRACT FORM (SBD7).**
2. TAX COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS
2.1 BIDDERS MUST ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR TAX OBLIGATIONS.
2.2 BIDDERS ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THEIR UNIQUE PERSONAL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (PIN) ISSUED BY SARS TO ENABLE THE ORGAN OF STATE TO VERIFY THE TAXPAYER'S PROFILE AND TAX STATUS.
2.3 APPLICATION FOR TAX COMPLIANCE STATUS (TCS) PIN MAY BE MADE VIA E-FILING THROUGH THE SARS WEBSITE WWW.SARS.GOV.ZA.
2.4 BIDDERS MAY ALSO SUBMIT A PRINTED TCS CERTIFICATE TOGETHER WITH THE BID.
2.5 IN BIDS WHERE CONSORTIA / JOINT VENTURES / SUB-CONTRACTORS ARE INVOLVED; EACH PARTY MUST SUBMIT A SEPARATE TCS CERTIFICATE / PIN / CSD NUMBER.
2.6 WHERE NO TCS PIN IS AVAILABLE BUT THE BIDDER IS REGISTERED ON THE CENTRAL SUPPLIER DATABASE (CSD), A CSD NUMBER MUST BE PROVIDED.
2.7 NO BIDS WILL BE CONSIDERED FROM PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE, COMPANIES WITH DIRECTORS WHO ARE PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE, OR CLOSE CORPORATIONS WITH MEMBERS PERSONS IN THE SERVICE OF THE STATE."

NB: FAILURE TO PROVIDE / OR COMPLY WITH ANY OF THE ABOVE PARTICULARS MAY RENDER THE BID INVALID.

SIGNATURE OF BIDDER: .....

CAPACITY UNDER WHICH THIS BID IS SIGNED: .....
(Proof of authority must be submitted e.g. company resolution)

DATE: .....

STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF RFQ

- A submission submitted in response to this RFQ will constitute a binding offer which will remain binding and irrevocable for a period of **thirty (30) days** from the date of submission to the MHSC. Bidders may not modify their initial pricing offer whilst the RFQ validity period is still in force. **(RFQ Validity Period: 30 days from date of closure)**
- No service will be rendered, or goods delivered before an official MHSC Purchase Order has been issued to the awarded bidder.
- It is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure that its response reaches MHSC on or before the closing date and time of the RFQ.
- Bidders may not make any alterations or additions to the content of this bid document, except to comply with the instructions issued by the MHSC.
- There shall be no discussions with any enterprise until evaluation of the proposal has been complete.
- RFQ's received after closing time and date will be classified as **LATE** and will not be considered.
- With regards to pricing, where a bidder submits both a quote and SBD 3, should the total bid prices differ, or calculation errors be identified, the one indicated on the SBD 3 pricing schedule shall be considered the correct price.
- MHSC reserves the right to cancel this RFQ due to the following reasons:

a) Due to changed circumstances, there is no longer a need for the services specified in this RFQ.
b) Funds are no longer available to cover the total envisaged expenditure for the project.
c) No RFQ meets the required specifications.
d) There is a material irregularity in the RFQ process.
e) Bidder fails to deliver in accordance with the requirements of the RFQ. The MHSC reserves the right to terminate the contract/PO during the first week after work has commenced should the appointed service provider have misrepresented themselves and/or their product and will not be able to fulfil the requirements as contained in the contract.

TERMS OF REFERENCE/SCOPE OF WORK

1.1. OVERVIEW

The Mine Health and Safety Council is a national public entity (Schedule 3A) established in terms of the Mine Health and Safety Act, No 29 of 1996, as amended. The entity comprises a tripartite board represented by State, Employer, and Labour members under chairmanship of the Chief Inspector of Mines. The MHSC is funded by public revenue and is accountable to Parliament. The main task of the Council is to advise the Minister of Mineral Resources on occupational health and safety legislation and research outcomes focused on improving and promoting occupational health and safety in South African mines. The Council also oversees the activities of its committees; promotes a culture of health and safety in the mining industry; arranges a summit every two years to review the state of occupational health and safety at mines; and liaises with the Mining Qualifications Authority and any other statutory bodies about mining health and safety.

The MHSC invests significant resources in research and development, the development of legislation and guidelines, stakeholder engagement, and dissemination initiatives aimed at driving continuous improvements in MHS. Key initiatives conducting research on MHS, the development of MHS legislation and guidelines, and the Regional Tripartite Forums (RTFs), which provide platforms for stakeholder engagement, dissemination, collaboration and knowledge sharing. While these initiatives have been implemented over many years, there is limited evidence on their effectiveness, industry uptake, value for money, and contribution to improving MHS performance within the SAMI. There is therefore a need for a consistent and practical approach to assess whether these interventions are being effectively implemented, achieving their intended outcomes and contributing to improvements in MHS. The MHSC therefore intends to develop an Impact Evaluation Framework that can be applied across its research, legislative and stakeholder engagement (including RTFs) portfolio. The framework must enable the MHSC to evaluate the implementation, uptake, effectiveness and impact of its research, legislative and Page 06 stakeholder engagement interventions (including RTFs), in a consistent, practical and evidence-based manner.

As part of this project, the framework will be piloted using Trackless Mobile Machinery (TMM) collision prevention regulatory requirements under Regulation 8.10. The pilot will be used to test the practicality and suitability of the framework, assess its ability to generate meaningful evidence on effectiveness and impact, and identify any refinements required before its broader application across the MHSC's research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio.

The scope of this project does not include the evaluation of the entire MHSC portfolio. The evaluation component of this assignment will be limited to the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements selected for the pilot.

1.2. DESCRIPTION

The MHSC seeks to appoint a service provider to develop a practical Impact Evaluation Framework for assessing the effectiveness and impact of the MHSC's research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio, and to pilot the framework using the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements under Regulation 8.10. The framework must be practical, evidence-based and suitable for future application across different types of MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement interventions, including the RTFs. However, for this assignment, the pilot evaluation will be limited to the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements under Regulation 8.10. The pilot will be used to test and refine the framework before its broader application across the MHSC portfolio.

1.3. DETAILED SPECIFICATIONS/SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work for the appointed service provider shall include, but is not limited to, the following;

1.3.1. Development of an Impact Evaluation Framework

- Conduct a focused review of relevant MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement interventions to understand the nature and different types of interventions that the framework must accommodate. The review must inform the design of the framework and does not constitute an evaluation of the entire MHSC portfolio.

- Review relevant monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment approaches applicable to research, legislative and stakeholder engagement interventions, including relevant good practices that can inform the MHSC framework.
- Develop a practical Impact Evaluation Framework that can be applied across the MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio, including RTFs. The framework must provide, where applicable, for the assessment of:
    - Relevance and intended objectives of the intervention.
    - Implementation and industry uptake.
    - Achievement of intended outputs and outcomes.
    - Effectiveness and impact.
    - Contribution to improvements in MHS.
    - Barriers and enabling factors affecting implementation and effectiveness.
    - Stakeholder experiences and perceptions.
    - Lessons learnt and opportunities for improvement.
- The framework must recognise the differences between research, legislative and stakeholder engagement interventions, including RTFs, and provide appropriate evaluation criteria, indicators and methods for each type of intervention.
- Develop practical indicators, minimum data requirements, data collection tools, assessment methods and reporting templates to support consistent application of the framework.
- Define appropriate approaches for establishing baselines and assessing changes over time, taking into consideration the availability and quality of historical data.
- Provide an appropriate approach for assessing the contribution of MHSC interventions to observed MHS outcomes, while recognising other factors that may influence such outcomes.
- Ensure that the framework is practical, evidence-based, repeatable and sufficiently flexible for future application by the MHSC across its research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio.

1.3.2. Piloting of the Framework in Alignment with Trackless Mobile Machinery (TMM) Collision Prevention Regulatory Requirements.

- Apply the draft Impact Evaluation Framework to the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements under Regulation 8.10.

- Review relevant regulatory, MHSC and industry documentation and available data relating to the development, implementation and outcomes of the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements.
- Develop a practical and proportionate sampling approach, in consultation with the MHSC, for selecting applicable mines for the pilot. The sampling approach must take into consideration relevant factors such as mine type, commodity, TMM exposure, availability of data, geographic coverage, project timeframe and available budget.
- Assess the implementation of the applicable TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements across the selected pilot sample.
- Assess available quantitative and qualitative evidence on the effectiveness of the regulatory requirements and their contribution to reducing TMM collision risks and improving mine safety.
- Compare relevant available information before and after implementation of the regulatory requirements, where sufficient and comparable data are available.
- Engage a targeted sample of relevant stakeholders to obtain evidence on the implementation, effectiveness and practical impact of the regulatory requirements. Existing MHSC and industry stakeholder platforms should be utilised where practical to minimise duplication and cost.
- Identify key barriers, challenges and enabling factors affecting the implementation and effectiveness of the regulatory requirements.
- Identify data gaps, data quality limitations and other factors that may affect the assessment of effectiveness and impact.
- Assess the practicality and suitability of the draft Impact Evaluation Framework, including its indicators, data requirements, data collection tools, assessment methods and reporting approach.
- Document the findings and lessons from the pilot, including recommendations for improving both the framework and its future application.
- The pilot is intended to test and refine the Impact Evaluation Framework through a targeted application. It is not intended to constitute a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation of Regulation 8.10 across the entire South African Mining Industry.

1.3.3. Provision Refine and finalise the Impact Evaluation Framework:

- Refine the Impact Evaluation Framework, indicators and supporting tools based on the findings and lessons from the TMM pilot.

- Ensure that the final framework is suitable for future application across the MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio, including RTFs.
- Develop practical guidance for the MHSC on how to select and apply appropriate evaluation criteria, indicators and methods depending on the type of intervention being evaluated.
- Develop a practical user guide setting out the steps for planning, conducting and reporting future impact evaluations using the framework.
- Define the minimum data requirements, roles and institutional arrangements required to support effective implementation and maintenance of the framework.
- Develop a practical roadmap for the future application and institutionalisation of the framework across the MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio.
- Present the final framework, TMM pilot findings and recommendations to the MHSC and conduct a knowledge-transfer session with relevant MHSC officials.

1.4. EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The expected deliverables are:

1.4.1. Inception Report: An inception report setting out the confirmed project methodology, work plan, stakeholder engagement approach, data requirements, sampling approach for the pilot, and approach for developing and testing the Impact Evaluation Framework.

1.4.2. Draft Impact Evaluation Framework: A practical draft framework for evaluating the effectiveness and impact of MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement interventions, including RTFs. The framework must include appropriate evaluation criteria, indicators, methodologies, minimum data requirements, data collection tools, assessment methods and reporting templates.

1.4.3. TMM Pilot Evaluation Report: A report on the application of the draft framework to the TMM collision prevention regulatory requirements under Regulation 8.10. The report must present findings on implementation, effectiveness and impact, based on available evidence, including key barriers, enabling factors, data limitations and lessons learnt. The report must also assess the practicality and suitability of the framework and identify areas requiring refinement.

1.4.4. Final Impact Evaluation Framework and User Guide: A refined Impact Evaluation Framework incorporating findings and lessons from the TMM pilot, together with practical guidance, indicators,

tools and templates to enable its future application across the MHSC research, legislative and stakeholder engagement portfolio, including RTFs.

1.4.5. Final Report and Implementation Roadmap: A final report consolidating the project findings, conclusions and recommendations, together with a practical roadmap for the future application and institutionalisation of the Impact Evaluation Framework within the MHSC. The service provider must also present the final framework, TMM pilot findings, recommendations and implementation roadmap to the MHSC and facilitate a knowledge-transfer session with relevant MHSC officials.

1.5. CONTRACT PERIOD

The project should be undertaken over a period of 9 months, with 6 months allocated to project activities, and the remaining 3 months dedicated to MHSC administrative and close-out activities.

1.6. SPECIAL CONDITIONS: EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The service provider must have at least 5 years' experience in conducting applied research. The project team must have members with the following expertise and qualifications

1.6.1. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Specialist (Project Leader)

The Project Lead will be responsible for the overall methodology, framework development, quality assurance and delivery of the project. The Project Lead must:

- Possess a Masters qualification in Monitoring and Evaluation, Evaluation Studies, Research, Public Policy or a related field.
- Have at least 10 years' experience in developing and applying monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment frameworks, including designing indicators, evaluation methodologies, data collection tools and reporting frameworks, and managing evaluation or research projects.

1.6.2. Mining Health and Safety Specialist

The specialist will ensure that the framework and pilot appropriately address the mining health and safety and regulatory context. The specialist must:

- Possess at least a Masters qualification in mining, occupational health and safety, engineering or a related field.
- Have at least 10 years' experience in mine health and safety within the mining sector.

1.6.3. Additional Experience

- Knowledge and experience in implementation science or implementation evaluation approaches, including assessing implementation, uptake, barriers, enabling factors and sustainability of interventions.
- Experience in evaluating the impact and uptake of research outcomes and recommendations.
- Knowledge of mining legislation, regulations, and industry best practices related to occupational health and safety.
- Demonstrated ability to engage with multiple stakeholders, including industry representatives, organised labour, regulators, researchers, and government entities.

RFQ EVALUATION PROCESS

SCM COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (RETURNABLE DOCUMENTS)

The RFQ will be evaluated in various phases as mentioned below:

a) **Phase 1:** SCM compliance requirements (returnable documents).

b) **Phase 2:** Functionality /Technical evaluation.

c) **Phase 3:** Price and Specific Goals evaluation.

Phase 1: SCM Compliance requirements (Returnable documents)

RFQs received will be verified for completeness and correctness. MHSC reserve the right to accept or reject an RFQ based on the completeness and correctness of the documentation and information provided. **No award will be done without complete provision of returnable documents and any schedules.**

Returnable documents are categorized as follows:

Invitation to Bid (SBD 1)	Fully completed and signed.
Bidders' Disclosure form (SBD 4)	Fully completed and signed.
SBD 6.1 (Preference Claim Form)	Fully completed and signed. **Proof of evidence:** • valid and certified sworn affidavit or B-BBEE certificate. • Bidders should ensure the points are correctly claimed for the specific goals and information is captured correctly and information is true.
Pricing Schedule (SBD 3).	The bidder must submit and attach to the RFQ response fully completed pricing Schedule (SBD 3). Pricing schedules must be completed **in full**.
Proof of registration on the Central Supplier Database (CSD) of National Treasury	Please provide proof of registration on the Central Supplier Database. Only suppliers who are

	registered with the Central Supplier Database (CSD) will be considered.
Tax Verification	Proof of Tax Verification PIN from SARS or CSD supplier number

NB: ***MHSC only conducts business with bidders whose tax matters and CSD registration are in order. Failure to comply in terms of tax obligations and CSD registration will render your RFQ non-responsive and disqualified. It is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure they are tax compliant and are registered on CSD at time of submitting their response.***

Phase 2: Technical / Functional Evaluation

Bidders are required to achieve a minimum threshold of 70% overall on the technical/functional evaluation criteria detailed below to qualify for progression to the next stage of evaluation.

No.	DESCRIPTION OF THE REQUIREMENT	WEIGHT	COMMENT OR REFERENCE TO PROPOSAL
1.	**CRITERIA 1: EXPERIENCE** **EXPERIENCE OF THE SERVICE PROVIDER /COLLABORATOR IN APPLIED RESEARCH OR CONSULTING (COMPANY PROFILE STATING NUMBER OF YEARS IN APPLIED RESEARCH OR CONSULTING MUST BE ATTACHED):** • Greater than 5 years' experience in applied research/ consulting = 5 points • 5 years' experience in applied research / consulting = 3 points • Less than 5 years' experience = 0 points • *No company profile attached or number of years not included = 0 points*	5	
2.	**CRITERIA 2: REFERENCE LETTERS** **SIGNED AND VERIFIABLE REFERENCE LETTERS ON VALID**	5	

	LETTER HEADS WITH CONTACTABLE DETAILS FROM ORGANISATIONS WHERE PREVIOUS RELATED RESEARCH WORK WAS CONDUCTED BY THE SERVICE PROVIDER (ATTACH VERIFIABLE REFERENCE LETTERS): • 5 or more reference letters that meet all criteria as stipulated above = 5 points • 4 reference letters that meet all criteria as stipulated above = 4 points • 3 reference letters that meet all criteria as stipulated above = 3 points • Less than 3 reference letters that meet all criteria as stipulated above = 0 points • No reference letter = 0 points ***Note: Letters that do not meet all the criteria as stipulated above will not be considered and will qualify for 0 points.***		
3.	**CRITERIA 3: PROJECT LEADER EXPERIENCE** **THE PROJECT LEAD MUST HAVE AT LEAST 10 YEARS' EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING AND APPLYING MONITORING, EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORKS, INCLUDING DESIGNIN INDICATORS, EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES, DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND REPORTING FRAMEWORKS, AND MANAGING EVALUATION OR RESEARCH PROJECTS. (CV STATING NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE MUST BE ATTACHED):** • More than 10 years' experience = 5 points • 10 years' experience sector = 3 points • Less than 5 years' experience or no CV attached =0 points	15	
4.	**CRITERIA 4: QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROJECT LEADER** **QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROJECT LEADER IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OR EVALUATION STUDIES OR RESEARCH OR PUBLIC POLICY OR A RELATED FIELD. (ATTACH COPIES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS):** • Doctoral degree = 5 points • Master's degree = 3 points • Less than Master's degree or no qualification = 0 points	15	

5.	**CRITERIA 5: MINING HEALTH AND SAFETY SPECIALIST EXPERIENCE** THE HEALTH AND SAFETY SPECIALIST MUST HAVE AT LEAST 10 YEARS' EXPERIENCE IN MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY WITHIN THE MINING SECTOR. (CV STATING NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE MUST BE ATTACHED): • More than 10 years' experience = 5 points • 10 years' experience = 3 points • Less than 10 years' experience or no CV attached = 0 point	10	
6.	**CRITERIA 6: QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MINING HEALTH AND SAFETY SPECIALIST** **QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MINING HEALTH AND SAFETY SPECIALIST IN MINING OR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY OR ENGINEERING OR A RELATED FIELD. (ATTACH COPIES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS):** • Doctoral degree = 5 points • Master's degree = 3 points • Less than master's degree or no qualification = 0 point	10	
7.	**CRITERIA 7: QUALITY OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL (METHODOLOGY, PROJECT SCOPE AND PROJECT SCHEDULE)** **THE PROJECT PROPOSAL MUST ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING FOUR REQUIREMENTS:** 1. Clearly defined methodology (design/approach to be taken, participants, datasets, study sites, instruments, procedures, etc). 2. The proposed methodology must be feasible (number of participants or accessibility of participants, accessibility of study sites, access to datasets, data collection access, sample sizes, etc.). 3. The proposal must sufficiently address all items of the project scope provided in the project terms of reference. 4. The proposal must have a project schedule comprising all expected project outcomes, clear timelines, and costing. (ATTACH PROJECT PROPOSAL AS PER THE PROVIDED PROPOSAL TEMPLATE)	40	

	• The proposal sufficiently addresses all the four requirements = 5 points • The proposal does not address all the four requirements = 0 points ***Note**: Proposals that reproduce the scope of work text verbatim, without interpreting or translating it into a clear methodological approach, will not be considered to have provided a valid methodology and will be scored = 0 points*		
TOTAL		100	

Phase 3: Price and Specific Goals Evaluation

PRICING INSTRUCTIONS	
1.	**Applicable currency**: All prices shall be quoted in South African Rand (R).
2.	**Completion of pricing schedule:** Bidders shall complete the pricing schedule in full, inserting all the information required therein.
3.	**Price Quotation Basis:** total prices quoted must be inclusive of all applicable taxes including VAT, less all unconditional discounts, plus all costs to deliver the services and/or goods. Where imported goods/services are to be used, and pricing is subject to exchange rate fluctuations, the exchange currency against the Rand must be stipulated, as well as the exchange rate at the time of bidding. The portion of the bid price subject to exchange rate fluctuations must be stated. Price changes whether because of CPI, PPI, industry extensions or expansions will be allowed in terms of the signed contract by both parties.)
4.	**Submission of pricing:** bidders must submit their pricing proposals with the technical proposal. The pricing folder must be clearly labelled as such.
5.	**Validity Period: SBD 3 is valid for 30 days from date of closure of this RFQ**
6.	**Payment terms: Payment will be made in accordance with Treasury Regulations 15.10.1.and 8.2.3 (within 30 days from receipt of invoice after completion of deliverables).**

PRICE SCHEDULE (SBD 3.1 Firm Unit Prices)

Tenderers are required to complete the following schedule of prices and ensure that the total price submitted encompasses all costs necessary to fulfil the requirements outlined in the specifications/scope of work. The total price is determined by multiplying the quantity of each line item by the corresponding unit price. Tenderers must include all necessary items and associated costs in their pricing schedule, as **NO ADDITIONAL OR HIDDEN COSTS WILL BE ACCEPTED OR CONSIDERED**.

Item	Qty	Description	Unit price	Total Price
1	1	Inception Report	R	R
2	1	Draft Impact Evaluation Report	R	R
3	1	TMM Pilot Evaluation Report	R	R
4	1	Final Impact Evaluation Framework and User Guide	R	R
5	1	Final Report and Implementation Roadmap	R	R
SUB TOTAL EXCL VAT				R
VAT @ 15%				R
GRAND TOTAL INCL VAT				R

TOTAL BID PRICE (VAT Inclusive): R……

Specific goals

Bid price proposals are compared on an equal and fair basis, considering all aspects of the bid pricing requirements. Qualifying bids are ranked on price and specific goals points claimed in the following manner:

(i) **Price** - with the lowest priced bid receiving the highest price score as set out in the Preferential Procurement Regulations 2022.

(ii) **Preference** - preference points are allocated in accordance with the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act (Act 5 of 2000) and its Regulations 2022 as claimed in the specific goals claim form (SBD 6.1) are added to the price ranking scores. The points for specific goals must be supported by a valid B-BBEE certificate or certified sworn affidavit.

A maximum of 80 points will be allocated for price on the following basis:

80/20

$$Ps = 80\left(1 - \frac{Pt - P\,min}{P\,min}\right)$$

Where;

Ps = Points scored for price of tender under consideration

Pt = Price of tender under consideration

Pmin = Price of lowest acceptable tender

A maximum of 20 points will be allocated for specific goals on the following basis:

- The tenderer must indicate how they claim points for each preference point system in line with the specific goals of the RFQ as outlined in SBD 6.1.

1.7. PRICE NEGOTIATIONS

The award of this RFQ may be subject to price negotiations where there are opportunities where prices are not market related. Under no circumstances will negotiation with any Bidders, constitute an award or promise/ undertaking to award the contract.

1.8. PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION ACT, 4 of 2013 (POPIA)

MHSC adheres to the Protection of Personal Information Act, 4 of 2013 (POPIA) requirements regarding personal information which came into effect 1 July 2021. As MHSC, we are committed to protecting your privacy and ensuring that personal information collected is used properly, lawfully, and transparently.

1.9. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

The service provider acknowledges that he is fully aware of the provisions of the OHS Act 85 of 1993 and that he is an employer in his own right with duties and responsibilities as prescribed in the Act.

1.10. IMPORTANT NOTICE TO BIDDERS

Bidders are to be aware of scammers who pose as MHSC employees selling bid documents or offering monetary gratuity in exchange for information or awarding of bids. MHSC is in no way selling the bid document, all documents shall be found on the MHSC website and National Treasury eTender Portal and awarded bids are notified through the website and MHSC shall never ask any bidder for monetary gratuity in exchange for information or manipulating outcome of bids.

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT (GCC)

In accordance with the Framework for Supply Chain Management [Section 76 (4) (c) of the PFMA] that was promulgated in Government Gazette Number 25767 on 5 December 2003 as Treasury Regulations, National Treasury is required to issue general conditions of contract and bid documentation for supply chain management. This Request for Quotation and any contract emanating from this Request for Quotation are subject to the General Conditions of Contract (GCC) which were revised in July 2010. The General Conditions of Contract (GCC) revised and issued by National Treasury in July 2010 are available on the website of National Treasury.

http://ocpo.treasury.gov.za/Resource_Centre/Legislation/General%20Conditions%20of%20Contract-%20Inclusion%20of%20par%2034%20CIBD.pdf

The SBD 7 contract form will be required, where applicable, from the recommended bidder upon award.

DUE DILIGENCE

The MHSC reserves the right to conduct supplier due diligence prior to final award or at any time during the contract period. This may include site visits, reference checks and requests for additional information. The MHSC may where applicable request samples from the bidder/s to confirm capability.

RFQ AWARD

Awarding of RFQ's will not be published on the National Treasury e-tender portal or MHSC' website. No regret letters will be sent out. An RFQ is considered awarded when an official purchase order as signed by the delegated authority of the MSC is issued to the service provider. Goods may be delivered, or services may be rendered only with an official purchase order as signed and issued by the MHSC.

REASONS FOR DISQUALIFICATION

MHSC reserves the right to disqualify any bidders who do not comply with one or more of the following RFQ requirements and may take place without prior notice to the bidder:

- Bidder whose tax matters are not in order (Instruction Note 09 of 2017/2018 Tax Compliance Status will apply).
- Bidders who are not registered with the Central Supplier Database (CSD).
- submitted incomplete information and documentation according to the requirements of this RFQ document.
- submitted information that is fraudulent, factually untrue or inaccurate information.
- received information not available to other potential bidders through fraudulent means.
- failed to comply with mandatory and technical requirements as stipulated in the RFQ document.
- misrepresented or altered material information in whatever way or manner.
- promised, offered, or made gifts, benefits to any The Mine Health and Safety Council (MHSC) employee.
- canvassed, lobbied to gain unfair advantage.
- committed fraudulent acts; and

- acted dishonestly and/or in bad faith etc.

NB: it is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure the bid response is fully completed and signed and all required documents are valid and submitted upon closing date. The bidder should ensure that their response reaches the MHSC on the stipulated date and time.

Bidders are not allowed to contact any other MHSC staff in the context of this tender other than the indicated officials under SBD 1 above or as mentioned under "correspondences".

MHSC
Mine Health and Safety Council

BIDDER'S DISCLOSURE SBD4

1. PURPOSE OF THE FORM

1.1 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, 1996 (Constitution), and further expressed in the various applicable legislation, it is required for the bidder to make this declaration in respect of the details required hereunder.

1.2 If a person is 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. DECLARATION ON EMPLOYMENT BY ORGAN OF STATE

2.1 Is the bidder, or any of the directors / trustees / shareholders / members / partners of the bidder employed by an organ of state, as defined in section 239 of the Constitution? **YES/NO**

2.2 If YES, furnish particulars of the names, individual identity numbers, in the table below:

Full Name	Identity Number	Name of organ of state

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

2.3.1 If so, furnish particulars:

……
……

2.4 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**

2.4.1 If so, indicate all companies registered in the CSD in the table below:

Supplier registration number (MAAA)	**Status (active/inactive/deleted)**

Failure to disclose all CSD-registered active companies linked to all Directors will lead to disqualification**.**

3 GENERAL DECLARATION

I, ……....., the undersigned, 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 to be false.

3.3 The bidder has arrived at the accompanying bid independently from, and without consultation, communication, agreement or arrangement with any competitor.

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.

3.5 The terms of the accompanying bid have not been, and will not be, disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, to any competitor, prior to the date and time of the official bid opening or of the awarding of the contract.

3.6 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.

3.7 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, 1998 (Act No. 89 of 1998) and or may be referred to law enforcement agencies for criminal investigation and or may be restricted from conducting business with the state for a period not exceeding 10 years in terms of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act, 2004 (Act No. 12 of 2004) or any other applicable legislation.

I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE IS CORRECT.

I ACCEPT THAT THE PROCURING INSTITUTION MAY REJECT THE BID OR TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION AGAINST ME IF THIS DECLARATION IS FALSE.

……	……
Signature	Date
……	……...
Designation	Name of bidder

MHSC
Mine Health and Safety Council

SBD 6.1

PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2022

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

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

---

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

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

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

1.2 **To be completed by the organ of state**

(*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.

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 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS**

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

80/20

$$Ps = 80\left(1 - \frac{Pt - P\,min}{P\,min}\right)$$

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 points is allocated for price on the following basis: **80/20**

$$Ps = 80\left(1 + \frac{Pt - P\,max}{P\,max}\right)$$

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 (80/20 system) (To be completed by the organ of state)	Number of points allocated (example)	Number of points claimed (80/20 system) (To be completed by the tenderer)
Black owned enterprises "*enterprises owned by black people".* Persons historically disadvantaged on the basis of race:	**Total Points: 10** 100% black ownership = 10 76% to 99% black ownership = 8 61% to 75% black ownership = 6 41% to 60% black ownership = 4 20% to 40% black ownership = 2 0 to 19% black ownership = 0	For example, if the bidder's Black Ownership is between 61% and 75%, it will score/claim **6** points for 80/20	
Black women owned enterprises *"Enterprises owned by women"*	**Total Points: 5** 100% black women ownership = 5	For example, if the bidder is 61 to 75% owned by Women, it will score/claim **3** points for 80/20.	

Persons historically disadvantaged on the basis of gender:	76% to 99% black women ownership = 4 61% to 75% black women ownership = 3 41% to 60% black women ownership = 2 20% to 40% black women ownership = 1 0 to 19% black women ownership = 0		
Enterprises owned by Youth *"Enterprises owned by people who are youth.* Persons historically disadvantaged on the basis of youth.	**Total Points: 5** 100% owned by youth = 5 76% to 99% owned by youth = 4 61% to 75% owned by youth = 3 41% to 60% owned by youth = 2 20% to 40% owned by youth = 1 0 to 19% owned by youth = 0	For example, if the bidder is 61 to 75% owned by Youth, it will score/claim **3** points for 80/20.	
Total Points for Specific Goals	**20.00**		

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: ……

……

……

……