



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO CONDUCT A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MQA INTERVENTIONS IMPLEMENTED OVER THE PAST FIVE FINANCIAL YEARS (2020-2025).

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mining Qualification Authority (MQA) is a public entity established in terms of section 45 of the Mine Health and Safety Act No. 29 of 1996 (MHSA) and is a Sector Education and Training Authority (SETA) in terms of item 4A to the second schedule of the Skills Development Act, Act no. 97 of 1998 (SDA). The MQA is listed as a schedule 3(a) public entity in terms of the Public Finance Management, Act no. 1 of 1999 (PFMA) and has an Accounting Authority (the Board) that is constituted in terms of the MHSA, the SDA and its constitution.

The MQA is expected to inter alia respond to the National Development Plan (NDP) which aims to eliminate the historical and structural poverty, unemployment and reduce inequality by 2030. The NDP seeks to build the capacity of South African citizens to ensure that South Africa has adequate, appropriate and high-quality skills for economic growth, employment and social development. The National Skills Development Plan (NSDP) among others, responds to it by outlining outcomes to be met by various agencies through various interventions to increase access to high quality and relevant education and training and skills development opportunities, including workplace learning and experience, to enable effective participation in the economy and society by all South Africans and reduce inequalities.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

2.1 PURPOSE

The Mining Qualifications Authority (MQA) requires the services of a suitable and qualified service provider to provide the MQA with a comprehensive study in conducting evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions implemented for the past five financial years (2020-2025).

2.1.2 DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS

The extent to which an organisation achieves its planned objectives and intended outcomes using clear, observable, and quantifiable criteria, such as measurable indicators that show whether the desired results have been achieved

2.2 INTERVENTIONS FOR THE PAST FIVE FINANCIAL YEARS (2020-2025)

Programmes that have been implemented for the past five years are annexed on these terms of reference for ease of reference.

2.3 OBJECTIVES OF M&E UNIT

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Unit plays a critical role in tracking organisational performance and ensuring accountability. Its primary responsibilities include:

- Monitoring progress of projects, programmes, and policy implementation
- Measuring results and outcomes against planned objectives and targets, through Annual Performance Plan (APP)
- Ensuring accountability in the use of resources
- Supporting evidence-based decision-making, and
- Identifying areas for improvement to enhance organisational performance.

2.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

Through the above functions, the M&E Unit enables the organisation to assess whether its interventions are effective, efficient, relevant, and sustainable. It is therefore important that M&E appoints the service provider to conduct a comprehensive study on the effectiveness of MQA interventions implemented for the past five financial years.

The implementation evaluation assesses how effectively programmes have been delivered over the past five financial years, focusing on:

- Achievement of intended outputs and outcomes
- Efficiency and value for money
- Alignment with strategic priorities
- Quality of service delivery
- Functionality of the Theory of Change (ToC)
- Impact of the Interventions

3. SCOPE AND DEFINITION OF WORK

3.1 The service provider should focus on the performance of the MQA interventions implemented over the past five years:

3.1.1 Implementation design and framework

- Documenting how implementation is happening in practice

3.1.2 Assessing and review Implementation

- Comparing the actual implementation to planned implementation
- Assessing the quality-of-service providers that have implemented MQA funded programmes
- Investigate the design, the complexity and provide evidence-based findings of the practice of the policies and programmes that are being implemented
- How is the theory of change working in practice

3.1.3 Improving implementation

- Identifying what is working and what is not working

3.1.4 Enriching impact evaluation

- Better understanding what difference our activities are making

3.1.5 Evaluating innovative programme (upscaling models)

- What elements of the intervention could be upscaled

4. DELIVERABLES

4.1 Project Execution Plan (Project Inception Report): a comprehensive document that outlines the evaluation topic, problem statement, rationale, significance of the study, evaluation questions, key objectives, value of the evaluation study, scope, timelines, deliverables, resources, risks, communication protocols, payment plan for each deliverable and stakeholders involved in a project, providing a blueprint for its successful implementation.

4.2 MQA policy (Literature) review and the theoretical Framework outlining: the conceptual approach-theories, models, ideas that will ground the study. Theoretical model/ Conceptual framework and analytical tool to make sense of matters pertaining to the evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions implemented in the past five financial years.

4.3 Evaluation Design and Methodology: evaluation research paradigm, methodological approaches, target population and sampling procedures, data collection methods, data analysis, ensuring trustworthiness (reliability, validity, and generalizability) of evaluation findings, ethical considerations, delimitations, and limitations of the evaluation study.

4.4 Data sets and raw data: Providing the collected data in a usable format, allowing other evaluators /researchers to analyse and build upon the study's findings.

4.5 Draft Analysis Report: which will undergo a review before being finalised (Staff, Evolution/ research Review Team, Board). The draft report typically includes the methodology employed, data analysis, initial findings, and recommendations. It serves as a working document that allows stakeholders, experts, or project supervisors to provide input, suggest revisions, and ensure the accuracy and completeness of the study.

Feedback received during the review process helps to refine the report, address any gaps or inconsistencies, and improve the overall quality of the final research report.

4.6 Presentation of Draft Report: A visual presentation summarizing the evaluation study's main points, which can be used to communicate the evaluation findings to the internal stakeholders such as the staff, Governance Strategic Committee (GSC) and Board.

The following will be the outputs of the evaluation study:

4.7 Final Evaluation Report and Executive Summary: A comprehensive evaluation report that outlines the topic, problem statement, evaluation questions and objectives, philosophical worldview (paradigm), hybrid methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The report will include an executive summary providing a concise overview of the study's key findings, recommendations, the MQA implementation model to enhance the effectiveness of skills development going forward, and the broader implications for skills development

4.8 Presentation: A visual presentation summarizing the Evaluation study's main points, which can be used to communicate the evaluation findings to a spectrum of stakeholders, decision makers, policy and practitioners, or a broader audience.

4.9 Advisory Report: Highlighting key findings and implications on the evaluation study on effectiveness of Interventions implemented in the past five financial years that could be communicated to a spectrum of stakeholders, decision-makers, policy practitioners or a broader audience.

5. APPROPRIATE QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE, SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

5.1 The suitable bidder must have the required experience in evaluation of interventions implemented in Sector Education and Training Authority (SETA), Public Institutions, Government Organisations with extensive knowledge of skills development, wide understanding of, Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and the National Evaluation Policy Framework.

5.2 Company Experience

Bidders must provide MQA with reference letters from different clients in evaluating the effectiveness of interventions implemented.

5.3 Capacity and expertise

Bidders must provide a CV of a qualified and experienced professionals with experience in the evaluation of effectiveness of Implemented interventions.

6. DURATION OF THE EXPERTISE

6.1 The successful bidder will be appointed to render the requisite service for a maximum period of twenty-four (24) months.

6.2 Work will start upon signing the service provider contract.

7. INTEGRITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

7.1 The service provider shall always exhibit the highest level of integrity in the performance of all professional assignments and will accept only assignments for which there is a reasonable expectation that the assignment will be completed with professional competence.

7.2 The successful service provider is required to conduct the assignment and compile the required reports and or information with the utmost integrity and honesty, and collect sufficient, appropriate evidence to ensure that the ultimate solution will assist the MQA to achieve its organisational goals and objectives.

8. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The service provider will report directly to the Chief Risk Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (CRMEO) or a delegated representative, as and when required.

9. PROJECT PROPOSAL

The successful bidder will be required to submit the following:

9.1 A short profile of the service provider.

9.2 All the documents required as per the evaluation criteria.

9.3 The cost/fee breakdown (itemised) for the services to be rendered

10. PROJECT PLAN

Based on the information provided in this document, the successful bidder is to submit a project execution plan with deliverables and timelines that the prospective service provider deems suitable for the delivery of the proposed project. The MQA will consider and approve the project plan before commencement of the project.

11. PROJECT PRICING

- 11.1 The amount quoted must be denominated in South African Rand, and should include VAT.
- 11.2 The quoted price should be as per the scope of work and all inclusive.
- 11.3 The MQA may subject the award of the proposal to price negotiation with the preferred service provider. This will, however, be exercised subject to the following principles.
 - 11.3.1 Negotiation may not allow any preferred service provider a second or unfair opportunity.
 - 11.3.2 Is not detrimental to any other prominent service provider; and
 - 11.3.3 Does not lead to a higher price than the proposal as submitted.

12. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals for the appointment of the service providers will be evaluated in three (3) phases.

The first phase will be compliance, the second phase will be functionality and the third phase will be pricing and specific goals in accordance with the Supply Chain Management Procurement policies (Preferential Point System).

A bidder will only go to the next phase of evaluation if they have met the requirements of the previous phase of evaluation.

12.1 PHASE ONE (1): COMPLIANCE

RETURNABLE DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED

- 12.1.1 Proof of registration on Central Supplier Database System (CSD)
- 12.1.2 Valid Tax Clearance Certificate (Refer to SBD 2: Tax Clearance Certificate Requirements) or Tax PIN;
- 12.1.3 B-BBEE Certificate of Measured Entity (if no certificate is received, a score of zero will be allocated for evaluation purposes);
- 12.1.4 SBD 1: Invitation to Bid fully completed and appropriately signed;
- 12.1.5 SBD 3.3: Pricing Schedule fully completed and appropriately signed;
- 12.1.6 SBD 4: Disclosure of Interests Form fully completed and appropriately signed;
- 12.1.7 SBD 6.1: Preference Points Claim Form, fully completed and appropriately signed;

NB: Bidders who fail to submit the above documents will be disqualified and will not be evaluated further, however, to the extent that the applicable laws and regulations permit, bidders will be contacted to address outstanding information within a reasonable timeline as determined by the MQA. The request of such outstanding information will not be information that affects the substance of the bid or give a bidder unfair advantage to the other bidders.

12.2 PHASE TWO (2) FUNCTIONALITY

The proposal will be evaluated on a five-point scale as follows:

0 = Required documents not submitted / submitted information is irrelevant.

1 = Poor, does not meet criteria.

2 = Fair, less than acceptable. Not sufficient for performance requirements.

3= Satisfactory, adequate for the performance requirements.

4= Very good, above the average compliance to the requirement.

5= Excellent, exceptional mastery of the requirement



No	KPA	ELEMENT	WEIGHT	SCORING MATRIX
1.	Evaluation Study reference letters from different clients in evaluating the effectiveness of interventions implemented (services rendered in SETA,s, public institution and government entities will be an added advantage.)	Proven company experience with a strong understanding of the Monitoring and Evaluation and demonstrated expertise in conducting evaluations to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact, and sustainability of MQA interventions. Submit a minimum of five (5) reference letters from different clients on intervention implementation. For the reference letter to comply it must meet the following: Ø Be on the client's letter head, signed by relevant officials, dated, with contactable details (email/phone numbers), relating to work done within a period of 5 years prior	10	0 = No submission/submission of irrelevant documents 1 (Poor) = 2 or less compliant reference letter satisfying the minimum set out in the element. 2 (Fair) = 3 less than 5 compliant reference letters satisfying the minimum requirements set out in the element. 3 (Satisfactory) = 5 compliant reference letters satisfying the minimum requirements set out in the element. 4 (Very Good) = 5 compliant letters satisfying the minimum requirements set out in the element, with 1 letter indicating previous evaluation study experience in SETA,s, public institution and government entities. 5 (Excellent) = 5 compliant letters satisfying the minimum requirements set out in the element, with at least 2 letters from 2 different organisations indicating previous evaluation study experience in the Public

		to closing date of this request for proposal. NB: Bidders are encouraged to complete the provided template in line with the submitted signed reference letters. The MQA reserves the right to contact the provided reference clients via their provided contact details and should such reference clients not confirm the work and services as in the reference letter, the MQA shall consider such provided letter to not be compliant.		Institutions and Government Entities.
2.	Capacity and expertise with five (5) years in evaluation of interventions implemented, in the SETA, Public Institution or Government entities	2.1 Policy Expert/Analyst Provide a CV of Policy Expert/Analyst with a minimum of five years' Work Experience	10	0= No submission or irrelevant information 1 = A CV provided of a Policy Expert/Analyst with 24 months experience, less than 48 months experience in Policy Evaluation 2 = A CV provided of a Policy Expert /Analyst with 48 months experience, less than

	Qualifications of the personnel for experience in the evaluation of interventions implemented. NB: the proposal must indicate the name of the person to be individually evaluated as a Policy	NB: MQA will only accept CVs as per the template provided in Annexure B. CVs on a template other than the one provided in the Annexure B will not be considered during the evaluation.		60 months experience in Policy Evaluation 3= A CV provided of a Policy Expert /Analyst with 60 months experience –less than 72 months experience in Policy Evaluation. 4 = A CV provided of a Policy Expert /Analyst with 72 months experience – less than 84 months experience in Policy Evaluation 5 = A CV provided of a Policy Expert /Analyst with 84 months or more experience in Policy Evaluation
	analyst/expert, Lead evaluator or Project Manager, failure to which will result in a score of Zero being awarded Qualifications obtained from institutions outside South Africa must be accompanied by the certificate of evaluation from SAQA.	2.1.2 Provide a Qualification at NQF level nine for the following qualifications Policy Expert/Analyst Qualifications: Provide a Degree at NQF 9 in (Monitoring & Evaluation, Public Policy, Development Studies, Economics, Research, Statistics and Business Management) NB: Certified copies of qualifications must be attached.	10	0= No qualification/s provided, Irrelevant Qualification /s 1 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 7 2 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 8, 3= Qualification pitched at NQF level 9, 4 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 10 5 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 10, with professorship status

		The qualifications certifying date stamp must be valid for 6 months prior to the closing date of this request for proposal.		
		2.2.1 Project Leader/ Manager Provide one (1) CV of a person at senior level (serving as the Researcher /Evaluation Project Manager) who has a minimum of ten (10) years' experience in leading evaluation/research projects. NB: MQA will only accept CVs as per the template provided in Annexure B. CVs on a template other than the one provided in the Annexure B will not be considered during the evaluation.	10	0= No compliant CV submitted or irrelevant experience 1 = A compliant CV provided of a qualified person with less than 60 months' relevant experience. 2 = A compliant CV provided of qualified personnel with 60 months – less than 120 months' relevant experience. 3= A compliant CV provided of qualified personnel with 120 months – less than 132 months' relevant experience. 4 = A compliant CV provided of qualified personnel with 132 – less than 144 months' relevant experience. 5 = A compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 144 or more months' relevant experience.
		2.2.2 Project Leader/ Manager (Qualifications) Provide certified	10	0 = No qualification provided 1 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 7 or less.

		copies of qualifications of a person at Senior level (serving as the Lead Evaluation/Project Manager) who at least has a qualification pitched at NQF level 9 in any of the following qualifications (Monitoring & Evaluation, Public Policy, Development Studies, Economics, Research, Statistics ,Business Management, Public Management and Governance studies and Project Management) Certified copies of qualifications must be attached. The qualifications certifying date stamp must be valid for 6 months prior to the closing date of this request for proposal. Project Team members who submit qualifications obtained from		2 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 8. 3= Qualification pitched at NQF level 9. 4 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 10 including Project Management qualification/certification. 5 = Qualification pitched at NQF level 10, with professorship status and project management qualification/certification
--	--	---	--	--

		institutions outside South Africa must for each qualification submit be accompanied by the certificate of evaluation from SAQA.		
		2.3.1 Senior Evaluator Provide one (1) CV of prospective project team member serving as the Senior Evaluator and individually having 5 years' experience in conducting evaluation study. NB: The proposal must indicate the names of persons to be separately evaluated as Senior Evaluator for individually experience in conducting, failure to which will result in a score of zero (0) being awarded. MQA will only accept CVs as per the template	10	0=No compliant CV submitted and irrelevant experience. 1= Compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 24 months less than 48 months' relevant experience. 2= Compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 48 –less than 60 months' relevant experience. 3= Compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 60 – less than 72 months' relevant experience. 4= Compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 72 less – than 84 months' relevant experience. 5= Compliant CV provided of a qualified person with 84 or more months' relevant experience.

		provided in Annexure B. CVs on a template other than the one provided in The Annexure B will not be considered during the evaluation.		
		2.3.2 Senior Evaluator (Qualifications) Provide a qualification of one (1) prospective project team member with a qualification pitched at least at NQF level 8 serving as a senior evaluator in any of the following qualifications. (Monitoring & Evaluation, Public Policy, Development Studies, Economics, Research, Statistics, Business Management, Public Management and Governance studies) NB: Certified copies of qualifications must be attached. The qualifications certifying date	10	0= No qualification provided or irrelevant qualification. 1= Qualification pitched at NQF level 6. 2= Qualification pitched at NQF level 7. 3= Qualification pitched at NQF level 8. 4= Qualification pitched at NQF level 9. 5= Qualification pitched at NQF level 10.

		stamp must be valid for 6 months prior to the closing date of this request for proposal. Project Team members who submit qualifications obtained from institutions outside South Africa must for each qualification submit be accompanied by the certificate of evaluation from SAQA.		
		2.4.1 Junior Evaluator Provide at least two (2) CVs of prospective project team members serving as the Junior Evaluators with at least individual 3 years' experience in conducting evaluation study NB: Junior Evaluators will be evaluated individually weighted at 5 points each.	10	0=No compliant CVs submitted or irrelevant experience. 1= Compliant CVs provided of Junior Evaluator with 12 months' less than 24 months relevant experience. 2= Compliant CVs provided of Junior Evaluator with 24 months – less than 36 months' relevant experience. 3= Compliant CVs provided of Junior Evaluator with 36 months –less than 48 months' relevant experience. 4= Compliant Cvs provided of Junior Evaluator with 48

		The proposal must indicate the names of persons to be separately evaluated as Junior Evaluators for individually experience in conducting, failure to which will result in a score of zero (0) being awarded. MQA will only accept CVs as per the template provided in Annexure B. CVs on a template other than the one provided in the Annexure B will not be considered during the evaluation.		months – less than 60 months’ relevant experience. 5= Compliant CVs provided of Junior Evaluator with 60 or more months’ relevant experience.
		2.4.2 Junior Evaluators (qualifications) Provide qualifications of two (2) prospective project team members with qualifications pitched at least at NQF level 8 serving as Junior Evaluators	10	0= No qualification provided or irrelevant qualifications. 1= Qualifications of Junior Evaluator pitched at NQF level 6 . 2= Qualifications pitched of Junior Evaluator at NQF level 7.

		in any of the following qualifications. (Monitoring & Evaluation, Public Policy, Development Studies, Economics, Research, Statistics, Business Management, Public Management and Governance studies. Certified copies of qualifications must be attached. NB: Evaluators will be evaluated individually weighted at 5 points each The qualifications certifying date stamp must be valid for 6 months prior to the closing date of this request for proposal. Project Team members who submit qualifications obtained from institutions outside South Africa for each qualification		3= Qualifications of Junior Evaluator pitched at NQF level 8 . 4= Qualifications of Junior Evaluator pitched at NQF level 9. 5= Qualifications of Junior Evaluator pitched at NQF level 10.
--	--	---	--	--

		submit must be accompanied by the certificate of evaluation from SAQA. Please ensure that you provide the names of the two junior Evaluators for whom evaluations will be conducted. Where one's qualifications or experience exceed those of the other, the minimum will be considered.		
3.	An Exploratory Study on the State and Nature of Services Rendered to SETAs, Public Institutions, Government Entities, and MMS on Interventions Implemented.	Draw up an evaluation proposal on a randomly selected services rendered in a SETA, public institution and government entities or Mining and Mineral Sector (MMS) clearly stating the following sub-headings: 1. Introduction and background- provide an overview of the institution where evaluation	10	0=No compliant evaluation proposal submitted. 1=Proposal submitted covering five (5) or less elements of the proposals. 2= Proposal submitted covering more than five (5) but less than ten (10) elements. 3= Compliant proposals submitted covering all the ten (10) elements of the proposals. 4= Compliant proposals submitted covering all the ten

		services were rendered. 2. Problem Statement -outline the evaluation problem or gaps in knowledge- in theory, research, or practice that the inquiry seeks to address. 3. Evaluation purpose: aims, research questions and objectives of the evaluation study. 4. Importance of the study- discuss the potential (skills development) implications and benefits of the evaluation study for the MQA and more importantly in the services rendered in a SETA, public institution, government entities and MMS . 5. Theoretical Framework- (Brief review of literature) explain the conceptual framework and that	(10) elements of the proposals and Risk Register with a Risk Mitigation plan. 5= Compliant proposals submitted covering all the ten (10) elements of the proposals and Risk Register with a Risk Mitigation plan as well the budget.
--	--	--	--

		analytical tool to be applied to make sense of the topic. This means briefly highlighting theories/models or ideas that will form the foundation and inform various phases of the evaluation study of the interventions implemented. 6. Evaluation Methodology- Describe the overall approach and the design of the evaluation study – indicating whether it is qualitative or quantitative methodology. 7. Target population and sampling framework- explaining the methods and techniques to be used to select population and the rationale thereof. 8. Data Management – discuss data		
--	--	---	--	--

		collection and techniques to use, outlining statistical and qualitative data analysis techniques to be used to make sense of data and make inferences and draw conclusions. 9. Reliability and Validity-explain how trustworthiness of findings will be ensured to ensure credibility, dependability of the study. 10. Limitations and delimitations of the evaluation study. NB: Please note the proposal must have the stated elements, clearly marked as subheadings		
TOTAL			100	

Note: All service providers who will score less than 65 out of 100 points for functionality will not be considered further and will be regarded as having submitted a non-responsive proposal.

12.3 PHASE THREE (3): PRICING AND SPECIFIC GOALS

During the third phase proposals will be evaluated using the 80/20 preference points system in accordance with the PPPFA guidelines. Based on this system the points will be allocated as follows:

Mining Future Skills

Criteria	Points
Price	80
Specific goals	20

Specific goals Points will be awarded to a bidder in accordance with the table below:

PREFERENCE GOAL	80/20	Documents for verification
GOAL 1 – B-BBEE Status Level of Contributor Maximum Points	15	
1	15	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
2	14	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
3	10	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
4	8	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
5	6	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
6	5	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
7	4	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
8	2	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
Non-compliant contributor	0	

GOAL 2 – Promotion of Black Woman/Youth/ Disable/Rural Area Maximum Points	5	Documents for verification
Business owned by equal to or more than 50% black people who are woman	2	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
Business owned by equal to or more than 50% black people who are youth	1	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
Business owned by equal to or more than 50% black people with disability	1	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit
Business owned by equal to or more than 50% black people living in rural areas	1	B-BBEE Certificate/Sworn Affidavit

Service Providers must submit original and valid B-BBEE Status Level Verification Certificate or certified copies thereof, issued by accredited Verification Agencies by SANAS or Registered Auditor approved by the Independent Regulatory Board of Auditors (IRBA), together with their bids, to substantiate their B-BBEE claims. Exempted Micro Enterprise must submit a letter from the Accounting Officer who is appointed in terms of the Close Corporation Act.

Service Providers who do not submit B-BBEE Status Level Verification Certificate or Sworn Affidavit are non-compliant contributors to be B-BBEE and do not qualify for preference points for specific goals.

The MQA is an equal opportunity and affirmative action employer. It shows the same commitment to those who wish to provide services to the MQA via the procurement process. It should be noted that regard will be given to those proposals from persons or companies which were previously disadvantaged, or which show evidence of skills transfer and representativeness. This does not preclude the formation of consortiums or the inclusion of proposals on how this project can be used to further the aims of transformation.

13. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BID

- 13.1 Awarding of this contract will be subject to the service provider's acceptance of the Supply Chain Management's general conditions of contract.
- 13.2 The MQA reserves the right to terminate the contract if there is clear evidence of non-performance and or poor quality of work.
- 13.3 MQA may at its sole discretion, award an assignment or any part thereof to more than one bidder (s).
- 13.4 Payment will only be made for acceptable work completed and timeously delivered.
- 13.5 The MQA may undertake due diligence to qualifying service provider to ascertain functionality.
- 13.6 Mining Qualifications Authority reserves the right not to award the bid to service providers.
- 13.7 Any suggestions during the progress meetings, once accepted by both parties, shall form part of the contract.



14. ENQUIRIES

Technical Enquiries

Name and Surname: Sonwabile Xaba

Email address: SonwabileX@mqa.org.za

Contact details: 011 547 2650

Supply Chain Enquiries

Name and Surname: Tsholo Dilape

Email address: TsholoD@mqa.org.za

Contact details: 011 547 2628

