



NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR COUNCIL

P.O.BOX 1775, SAXONWOLD, 2132 – 14A JELICOE AVENUE, ROSEBANK 2196
TELEPHONE +27(0) 11 328 4200 WEBSITE: WWW.NEDLAC.ORG.ZA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR A SERVICE PROVIDER TO CONDUCT MICROSOFT OFFICE 365 TRAINING SPECIFICALLY IN RELATION TO DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this RFP is to seek a service provider to conduct Microsoft Office 365 training, specifically focussing on the following applications: SharePoint, Microsoft Teams, One drive, People, Planner, Dynamic 365 and third party applications for Nedlac staff, segregated at different levels of expertise.

1. BACKGROUND

In the past year Nedlac has had to make use of remote working solutions for staff working from home. Staff have had to make use of applications such as remote VPN servers, Zoom and Microsoft Teams. Licensing has been procured for the Microsoft Office 365 Suite; however, Nedlac is not using the suite of applications to its full potential. Sharepoint is one of the Microsoft Office 365 applications that can be used as a document information management system. These new working methods have changed the ways of work and have presented a significant learning curve for staff.

2. SCOPE OF WORK

2.1. The service provider is required to conduct Microsoft Office 365 training to for Nedlac staff. The training is two-fold:

- a) Better use Microsoft Office 365 and the specific applications referenced in point 1, in order to work remotely more efficiently, including the arrangement of meetings, distribution of documents and management of tasks between teams
- b) A comprehensive document management information system for easy access and retrieval of meeting documentation

2.2. The service provider is required to provide assessed and certified training to Nedlac staff to be able to use and develop customised applications and train

others on the following Microsoft suites: SharePoint, Microsoft Teams, One drive, People, Planner, Dynamic 365 and third-party applications.

2.3. The customised training will be segregated as follows:

- a) Basic level: 5 Administrators
- b) Advanced level: 15 middle-senior level staff members
- c) Specialised Level (Dynamic 365) – 5 SCM officials

2.4. The specific requirements for each level of staff will be agreed between Nedlac and the service provider and specified in the service level agreement.

3. REQUIREMENTS

3.1. The successful service provider must show that they have done certified training on Microsoft Office for more than five years and at least one year of training on Microsoft Office 365. This must be demonstrated by provision of:

- 3.1.1. Copy of CVs of person(s) to provide training
- 3.1.2. At least three examples of previous similar work
- 3.1.3. Three contactable references.

4. SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS

Bidders must submit the following documents:

- 4.1. A proposal outlining the approach and methodology as to the execution of the terms of reference.
- 4.2. Budget indicating all the cost assumptions and a maximum amount for the assignment;
- 4.3. Proof that the firm is in good standing with the South African Revenue Services (SARS).
- 4.4. Entity ownership type and BBBEE certificate if relevant.
- 4.5. Company registration.
- 4.6. Contact details and physical address.
- 4.5. Company profile, including CVs of relevant individuals which must clearly demonstrate the necessary skills and experience in the area of expertise listed below.
- 4.7. Three contactable references.
- 4.8. Details of three to five projects that are similar in nature

5. BID SUBMISSION AND ENQUIRIES

- 5.1. Bidders should send their completed bids and accompanying relevant documentation to SCM unit by 10 November 2020
- 5.2. Any questions regarding the RFP should be emailed to SCM.
- 5.3. Note that no late proposals will be considered.
- 5.4. Nedlac reserves the right to cancel this bid should such be deemed necessary.

6. SELECTION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria to be utilised will be the following:

5= Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, 1= Unacceptable

The minimum functionality points of seventy (70) is required to qualify to be evaluated for pricing and BEE in phase two.

The below matrix will be used in scoring the proposals: Description of Quality Criteria and Sub-criteria	Scoring	Weight
Total Functionality	Total Score	100%
A. Approach and methodology in managing this project which should include:		
Interpretation of Terms of Reference to demonstrate understanding of what is required:		
5. Excellent understanding of what is required in the terms of reference; innovative and practical approach to developing the proposal; proposed action plan including milestones and timeframes.	5 = Excellent	20%
4. Good understanding of what is required in the terms of reference; practical approach and methodology; proposed action plan including milestones and timeframes.	4 = Good	
3. Satisfactory (or repeat of ToRs) understanding of what is required in the terms of reference; generic or text book approach and methodology; proposed action plan including milestones and timeframes.	3 = Satisfactory	
2. Poor understanding (wrong interpretation) of what is required in the terms of reference and missing one of the of the following critical components.	2 = Poor	
1. No action plan submitted.	1 = Not Acceptable	
B. Certified Expertise		
Service providers (companies/individuals) must prove competency and expertise in one/more of the following areas: Information Computing Technology, Training provider qualification, SETA accreditation, SAQA accredited or any other relevant experience that can be demonstratable.		
50% or more of the team has a Microsoft Certificate (MTA, MCSE, MS 100/101, MSCA, ITIL): = Excellent	5 = Excellent	30%
Have a Post graduate Degree (Honors, Masters, /PHD) and Diploma in Information Computer Science or related = Good	4 = Good	
60% or more of the team has a Diploma or Advanced Certificate at NQF 6 = Satisfactory	3 = Satisfactory	
80% or more of the team has a Higher Certificate at NQF 5 = Poor	2 = Poor	
The team members only possess a National Certificate and below NQF 4&3&2&1 = Not Acceptable	1 = Not Acceptable	
C. Relevant experience		
To evaluate each of the above components, the following criteria will apply:		30%
5 and above years or more relevant experience = Excellent	5 = Excellent	

The below matrix will be used in scoring the proposals: Description of Quality Criteria and Sub-criteria	Scoring	Weight
Total Functionality	Total Score	100%
3 to 5 years' relevant experience = Good	4 = Good	
2 to 3 years' relevant experience = Satisfactory	3 = Satisfactory	
1 to 2 years' experience = Poor	2 = Poor	
0 to 1-year experience = Not Acceptable	1 = Not Acceptable	
D. Similar Training Completed		20%
Number of Completed Similar Projects:		
5 or More Completed Similar Projects = Excellent	5 = Excellent	
4 Completed Similar Projects = Good	4 = Good	
3 Completed Similar Projects = Satisfactory	3 = Satisfactory	
2 Completed Similar Projects = Poor	2 = Poor	
1 Completed Similar Projects = Acceptable	1 = Not Acceptable	