NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LABOUR COUNCIL

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

_____

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR AN APPLICATION TO MONITOR AND REPORT ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACTION PLAN COMMITMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Nedlac requires a service provider who will develop or source an application to monitor and report on the implementation of the Economic Recovery Action Plan commitments as per the scope of work below.

2. SCOPE OF WORK

A service provider is required to:

(a) Provide an application which can monitor and report on the implementation of the Economic Recovery Action Plan commitments, along the lines set out in Annexure A.

(b) Support Nedlac to develop the application to suit its own requirements;

(c) Train up to seven staff members on how to develop and use the application.

The application should preferably be part of the MS office suite, but the service provider can also suggest other operating systems that may be applicable.

3. REQUIREMENTS

3.1. The successful service provider must show that they have more than five years of experience in respect of:

3.1.1. Sourcing applications as per the scope of work;

3.1.2. Adapting the application to suit the requirements of clients' needs;

3.1.3. Train staff to be able to further develop and apply the application; and

3.1.4. Experience in change management for the implementation of the application

3.2. If appropriate, the service provider must indicate that they have the relevant accreditation from an IT vendor.

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 projects that are similar in nature, including:
- Project name
- Project objectives
- Role on the project
- Number of years worked on the project
- Relevance or link of the project to these terms of reference.

5. BID SUBMISSION AND ENQUIRIES

5.1. Bidders should send their completed bids and accompanying relevant documentation to SCM unit by 12h00 noon on 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.

5.5.   A service level agreement will be signed with the successful service provider setting out inter alia the agreed project plan. Payments will be made upon the achievement of milestones to be agreed on in the service level agreement.

6.   SELECTION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

6.1.   Evaluation criteria

The below matrix will be used in scoring the proposals:

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 an application; proposed action plan including milestones and timeframes; and a project monitoring and evaluation mechanism to ensure that the main deliverables (inception report, profile report and monthly report) are integrated and complementary	5 = Excellent	
4. Good understanding of what is required in the terms of reference; practical approach and methodology; proposed action plan including milestones and timeframes; and a project monitoring and evaluation mechanism to ensure that the two main deliverables are integrated and complementary	4 = Good	30%
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; and a project monitoring and evaluation mechanism to ensure that the two main deliverables are integrated and complementary.	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: approach and methodology; action plan; and project monitoring and evaluation mechanism	2 = Poor	
1. No action plan submitted.	1 = Not Acceptable	
B. Relevant Expertise		
Service providers (companies/individuals) must prove competency and expertise in one/more of the following areas: Computer Science, Information Technology, Telecommunications or any other relevant experience that can be demonstratable.		

The below matrix will be used in scoring the proposals: Description of Quality Criteria and Sub-criteria	Scoring	Weight
Total Functionality	**Total Score**	**100%**
50% or more of the team has a Post-graduate Degree (Honours/Masters/PHD): NQF 8&9&10 = Excellent	5 = Excellent	20%
60% or more of the team has a Bachelor's Degree/BTech NQF 7 = Good	4 = Good	
70% or more of the team has a Diploma or Advanced Certificate NQF 6 = Satisfactory	3 = Satisfactory	
80% or more of the team has a Higher Certificate NQF 5 = Poor	2 = Poor	
The team members only posses 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%
10 years or more relevant experience = Excellent	5 = Excellent	
5 to 10 years' relevant experience = Good	4 = Good	
3 to 5 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 Projects Completed		
Number of Completed Similar Projects:		20%
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	