




---

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**For the Provision of Services to the Jobs Fund to Undertake a Summative Evaluation of Youth Enterprise Development project**

---

**Programme Identification**

Name of Client	The Jobs Fund
Reference Number	PN558
Name of Sub-Project	Jobs Fund 2019/20 Project-Level Evaluations: Summative Evaluation of a Youth Enterprise Development project
Contracting Authority	Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC), National Treasury
Accountable Officer	Ms. Najwah Allie-Edries
Project Purpose	Provision of services to the Jobs Fund to undertake a Summative Evaluation

## Contents

1	Request for Proposal.....	4
2	Background Information .....	4
2.1	The Jobs Fund.....	4
2.2	The Youth Enterprise Development Initiative .....	5
2.2.1	Overview of the Project .....	5
3	Purpose of the Evaluation.....	6
3.1	Focus of the Evaluation.....	6
3.2	Methodology.....	7
3.3	Evaluation Questions .....	7
3.3.1	Relevance.....	7
3.3.2	Effectiveness .....	7
3.3.3	Efficiency .....	7
3.3.4	Impact .....	8
3.3.5	Sustainability.....	8
3.3.6	Job Creation Model Proficiency .....	8
3.3.7	Specific Evaluation Questions .....	8
3.4	Intended Users and Stakeholders of the Evaluation.....	9
4	Scope of the Services to be Provided.....	9
4.1	Sampling.....	9
4.2	Desktop Review.....	9
4.3	Monitoring & Result Measurement System Development and Fieldwork.....	10
4.4	Aggregation and Assessment of Research.....	10
5	Expected Outputs, Timeline and Milestones .....	10
5.1	Outputs .....	10
5.2	Estimated Timeline and Milestones.....	11
6	Proposals.....	11
6.1	Submission requirements .....	11
7	Key Personnel.....	12
7.1	Skills, Experience and Competencies.....	12

8 Evaluation Criteria..... 12

8.1 Stage One ..... 13

8.2 Stage Two..... 16

# 1 Request for Proposal

Suitably qualified service providers are requested to respond to this Terms of Reference (ToR) for evaluation services related to a Youth Enterprise Development project supported by the Jobs Fund. The Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC) wishes to engage a service provider to complete the evaluation within four months. The service provider must put forward the appropriate multi-disciplinary team with relevant experience to fulfil the evaluation requirements.

This request is issued by GTAC, under the authority of the National Treasury (NT), and will be made in accordance with NT procurement criteria and procedures.

## 2 Background Information

### 2.1 The Jobs Fund

The Employment Facilitation sub-programme was introduced by the National Treasury in 2011 to contribute to employment and inclusive growth by supporting innovative approaches to job creation and enterprise development. The main component of the programme is the Jobs Fund, a multi-year R9 billion investment which leverages complementary funding from public and private sector project partners.

The President announced the Jobs Fund during the State of the Nation Address on 10 February 2011. The objective of the Jobs Fund is to co-finance innovative public and private sector initiatives that will significantly contribute to job creation. The Jobs Fund operates on challenge fund principles, as a catalyst for innovation and investment in new ways of working that directly contribute to long-term sustainable employment creation.

Globally, challenge funds have emerged as an effective and versatile financing mechanism with which to channel public money to catalyse pro-poor innovation and investment in emerging markets and to provide profitable ways of improving market access for the poor. In practice, challenge funds are highly versatile, and can be deployed across a variety of contexts and sectors, targeting a range of outcomes from financial education to enterprise-linked poverty reduction and 'pro-poor' growth.

The ultimate development goal of a challenge fund is, through a finite intervention period, to stimulate a long-term change in the way that local supply chains and market systems work to overcome cost, technology, financial, etc. barriers that may have excluded poor producers and households in the past. Systemic change in the way that market systems work is typically the desired outcome of a challenge fund and is the product of a coincidence of factors (new technology, an environment conducive to investment, a strong and innovative private investor, etc.).

The Jobs Fund assists partners in piloting innovative approaches to sustainable job creation through four funding windows, namely, Enterprise Development, Support for Work-seekers, Infrastructure and Institutional Capacity Building. The Fund accepts applications from the private, public and non-governmental sector during calls for proposals and project partners are required to share both risk and costs by matching the grant fund allocation generally on a ratio of 1:1.

As well as focusing on creating jobs for the unemployed, the Jobs Fund has an explicit learning and knowledge dissemination agenda, which is intended to encourage new thinking and new approaches to job creation. During the implementation process, a significant body of learning has been generated. Project-level evaluation presents an opportunity to initiate the process of documenting and sharing these insights in terms of what models are most successful in job creation and which of these models are replicable and show promise for scalability.

## **2.2 The Youth Enterprise Development Initiative**

### **2.2.1 Overview of the Project**

The Youth Enterprise Development Initiative<sup>1</sup> is a market and supplier readiness enterprise incubator targeting black-owned businesses in the fashion, hospitality and beauty sectors of the economy. The project was approved by the independent Jobs Fund Investment Committee (JFIC) on 30 November 2017 and started implementing on 1 February 2018. It was contracted to implement over a 3-year period, with an additional 2 years of post-investment monitoring.

The Youth Enterprise Development Initiative intended to build local manufacturing capacity and sustainable township businesses which are then able to access markets and create jobs. Prior to applying to the Jobs Fund for funding, the Jobs Fund Partner<sup>2</sup> (JFP) had piloted the set-up of a Non-Profit Company (NPC) that was established to build local manufacturing capacity and sustainable township businesses. The NPC was established to contract aggregate and wholesale local producers, manufacturers and designers, and then combine best-practice in-house supplier development with a direct market channel for local entrepreneurs, via a network of retail outlets. The first retail outlet was set up in Soweto, Johannesburg.

The project that the JFP put forward to the Jobs Fund in the 6<sup>th</sup> Funding Round was to scale the existing pilot across 10 new sites, create a sustainable model for increasing youth participation in townships, and stimulate demand for local brands in the retail market. The retail outlets were to provide a platform for designers who were currently unable to access formal markets, to test their products, build brands and promote local manufacturing. The assumption was that the project activities would develop an entrepreneurial culture, increase designer and manufacturing capacity and develop sustainable local SMMEs in townships - thus growing the local economy and creating sustainable jobs.

Through the provision of on-going support and access to professional systems, finance and marketing, it would accelerate the enterprises of approximately 240 local entrepreneurs in the fashion, cosmetics, food, furniture and décor industries – including designers, manufacturers and retailers. The overarching objective was to increase local manufacturing and grow sustainable, competitive

---

<sup>1</sup> Full project name is not included and will be referred to as the “Youth Enterprise Development Initiative” in this ToR.

<sup>2</sup> Applicants apply for funding through a competitive process. The most competitive projects are awarded Grant Funding which is matched by the applicant on at least a 1:1 basis. These funded organisations are referred to as Jobs Fund Partners (JFPs).

businesses that can access formal markets and create jobs (particularly for youth and women). The project was contracted to establish 10 retail outlets within 12 quarters of implementation.

The following activities were to be undertaken to facilitate the creation new jobs via supported businesses and unlock barriers to self-employment through business skills and increased market access:

1. Provide Technical Assistance (TA) to approximately 240 local designers/brand owners and manufacturers in business/finance skills;
2. Set up and operationalise the NPC and the retail outlets;
3. Provide on-going marketing and facilitate linkages to markets beyond the retail outlets and NPC;
4. Facilitate access to finance; and
5. Implement a robust Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning system.

### **3 Purpose of the Evaluation**

The aim of the summative evaluation is to evaluate the project design, evaluate project implementation and performance against contracted targets, draw lessons learned during implementation as well as determine the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project in the intended market. The results of the evaluation will contribute to better informed decision-making, foster an environment of learning, promote greater accountability for performance and inform future programmes.

The evaluation should establish the extent of the impact achieved through capacity building, business support, market linkages and funding provision to the retail outlet operators. It should further determine the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project. The results of the evaluation will contribute to better understanding of how similar project models are designed, what would improve their probabilities of success, how contextual elements influence implementation, and how to better intervene in small-scale manufacturing within the context of township economies. The knowledge generated will be used to better inform decision-making, foster an environment of learning, promote greater accountability for performance and inform future programmes.

#### **3.1 Focus of the Evaluation**

The focus of the evaluation will be two-fold:

1. Review the Youth Enterprise Development Initiative's project design/project model and make recommendations for improvement (for both the JFP and the Jobs Fund), in terms of similar future initiatives; and
2. Assess the impact of the original project on the target beneficiaries (Designers, Marketing, administration staff, manufactures and retail outlet owners and operators), as well as the likely impact of the project in its current iteration.

The evaluation should cover the following:

- **Model Efficacy:** To find out whether the particular job creation intervention implemented by the JFP was effective (i.e. are new sustainable jobs being created as a result of the JF grant);
- **Accountability:** To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project results;
- **Learning:** To synthesise lessons that can help to improve selection, design and implementation of future similar projects and inform policy development;
- **Value for money (VfM):** Assessing the most advantageous combination of cost, quality and sustainability, considering the four VfM 'E's': economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity; And
- **Impact:** To assess the positive and negative changes that are as a result of the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This should involve impacts and effects resulting from the project on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators.

## 3.2 Methodology

A mixed method evaluation is recommended. The service provider is to carefully consider the project context and propose the most appropriate evaluation design and methods to be used to adequately measure the phenomenon in question.

## 3.3 Evaluation Questions

The service provider must use the five Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria in the evaluation, which are highlighted below. The proficiency of the project model in terms of job creation must also be investigated.

### 3.3.1 Relevance

Relevance will determine the extent to which the strategy and project activities are suited to the priorities and needs of the labour market; the manufacturers; the entrepreneurs; and the hired employees.

### 3.3.2 Effectiveness

This refers to the extent to which the project's objectives were achieved. Indicate performance over the life of the project in terms of targets and actuals as well as disaggregated beneficiary information.

### 3.3.3 Efficiency

Efficiency measures the outputs, qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs. It seeks to ascertain whether the project has used cost-effective resources possible in order to achieve optimised results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. Measures of VfM are of particular importance.

### **3.3.4 Impact**

The Impact criterion seeks to assess both positive and negative changes produced by the Jobs Fund supported project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This should include the effects and impacts attributable to the project on the local social, economic, political and development environment.

### **3.3.5 Sustainability**

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the Jobs Fund support has come to an end.

### **3.3.6 Job Creation Model Proficiency**

The overall Jobs Fund mandate is two-fold:

1. Permanent job creation, and
2. Extracting good practice through experimentation with innovative concepts, approaches or models.

This measure seeks to examine the project's methodology for job creation and to assess the appropriateness of the model within the context of other job creation models in comparable sectors, and within the broader context of South Africa.

### **3.3.7 Specific Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation will respond to the following questions:

- Review the original theory of change for the project; which aspects held true and which did not. Why?
- Did the programme reach its appropriate target population? To what extent?
- Identify both the economic and social benefits of the project: Who has benefitted? To what extent have they benefitted? Have the target beneficiaries received their share of the social and economic benefits? What is the likelihood that benefits will continue to be seen?
- Has the project been able to catalyse job creation and, where applicable, create sustainable SMEs?
- Did beneficiaries receive an appropriate package of services? To what extent?
- Has the project created the necessary market linkages and networks to ensure in-flows and out-flows of goods and services in order to grow the SMEs throughout the value-chain, thus, create further employment opportunities?
- Has the project served as a catalyst for crowding-in further investment in the project and/or the surrounding social and business community?
- Was the funding available to beneficiary entrepreneurs structured appropriately?
- What obstacles were there for beneficiaries in accessing the once-off capex grants?
- Were the overall objectives of the project achieved? To what extent?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- What is an appropriate measure of impact (beyond job creation numbers) for the project?

- Have the retail outlets and the supported local manufacturers encouraged local economic growth? What are the multiplier effects of light infrastructure investment?
- Is there an appropriate pipeline for tenancy in the retail outlets? Is there sufficient demand for these types of retail stores in townships?
- Identify how this model works from a financial perspective but also from the view of critical success requirements.
- How can the results inform how the programme can be strengthened?
- Did the project best demonstrate the foundational objectives of the Jobs Fund?
- Where should government be intervening in the Wholesale & Retail and Manufacturing enterprise development space to ensure decent job creation and socio-economic impact for beneficiaries, particularly within township economies? Are there sector-specific issues to consider in the design of an intervention such as the Youth Enterprise Development Initiative?
- Identify other government funded enterprise development projects that focus on light Infrastructure Investment, Wholesale & Retail and Manufacturing. How have they fared in comparison to the Youth Enterprise Development Initiative? What can the Jobs Fund learn from these projects?

### **3.4 Intended Users and Stakeholders of the Evaluation**

The primary audience for the evaluation is the National Treasury Jobs Fund Project Management Office, the JFP Project Team, Policy Makers, Fund Managers and Programme Designers.

## **4 Scope of the Services to be Provided**

The evaluation will cover the period from inception of the project in February 2018 to April 2019. The evaluation will be limited to the project model design and its effectiveness, causes of suspension and remedial action required, and impact on beneficiaries of the project.

### **4.1 Sampling**

The selected beneficiaries should be a representative sample in terms of the various support/intervention packages offered by the project (i.e. technical and advisory assistance, training and capacity building, financial support and business development).

### **4.2 Desktop Review**

This will involve a review of relevant documentation to get an understanding of the project from inception to current status. This will include the collection, review and consolidation of:

- a. The project's application,
- b. Financial and performance audits,
- c. Quarterly performance reports,
- d. Activity Based Costing Project Implementation and Monitoring Plan (ABC PIMP),
- e. Any existing monitoring and evaluation results, either conducted by an internal or external service provider, and

- f. Pertinent literature relating to the subject matter, individual projects and methodology for the evaluation.

### **4.3 Monitoring & Result Measurement System Development and Fieldwork**

It is envisaged that the service provider will perform the following:

- a. Design the data collection methodology and instruments, as well as the analysis plan;
- b. Key informant interviews with:
  - Members of the Jobs Fund project team, and
  - Key stakeholders.
- c. Focus group discussions with:
  - Beneficiaries who are part of the projects,
  - Beneficiaries, including business owners, designers, manufacturers, etc., and
  - Project implementation staff.

### **4.4 Aggregation and Assessment of Research**

Based on the findings of the research process, the final report should extract the lessons gained from the investigation and provide recommendations for future projects and commensurate enabling public policies.

## **5 Expected Outputs, Timeline and Milestones**

### **5.1 Outputs**

The following outputs are expected:

- a. Evaluation work plan and design document including methodology, questions, analysis framework and data collection instruments (interview and group discussion guides),
- b. Inception report which includes the theory of change of the project (written and in a graphic format),
- c. Evaluation progress reports fortnightly,
- d. Draft report and presentation thereof,
- e. Final evaluation report updated based on the Jobs Fund Team and the TechnoServe Project Team's comments on the draft report,
- f. Presentation of the final report,
- g. Appendices with details on the methodology, informants, and data collection instruments,
- h. Raw data from data collection, and
- i. 5-page publishable article of the evaluation results, best practice guidelines and policy recommendations.

## 5.2 Estimated Timeline and Milestones

Presented below are the timeline and milestones envisaged for the evaluation. The specific details will need to be confirmed in negotiation with the Jobs Fund to ensure timely completion of the evaluation and delivery of the evaluation report.

Activity	Date	Deliverable*
Contract start date	February 2020	Finalised and signed contract
Inception meeting	February 2020	Inception report including Theory of Change
Evaluation work plan and methodology	February 2020	
Submission of draft report	March 2020	Draft evaluation report
Presentation of draft report	March 2020	Presentation
Submission of final evaluation report	March 2020	Final evaluation report
Presentation of final report (if requested by the Jobs Fund)	April 2020	Presentation

\* In addition to the specific deliverables, service providers will be required to submit a fortnightly progress report.

## 6 Proposals

GTAC reserves to right to appoint, and the service provider gives permission that previous employer and/ or institutions may be contacted to obtain references regarding the expertise and general standard work.

Based on the brief outlined in the terms of reference, the service provider is requested to write a proposal that responds to the Terms of Reference and proposes the approach to the evaluation. The ToR should serve as the basis, although enhancements to the brief will be welcomed as long as they are adequately substantiated.

### 6.1 Submission requirements

The proposal should include:

- a. Understanding of the evaluation and the Terms of Reference;
- b. Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation. This should include some description of the literature/documentation that will be used in the evaluation process. A plan should be presented of the data and methodologies envisaged for analysis;
- c. Activity-based plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities);

- d. Comprehensive activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT). A professional fees budget, combining clearly indicated individual fee rates with level of effort of all personnel (in person days), should be proposed, as well as anticipated direct costs;
- e. CVs of the key personnel listed in the template (team members, roles and level of effort);
- f. A quality assurance plan to ensure that the process and products of the evaluations are of good quality; and
- g. Evidence of written work (sample of short paper, report or policy brief written by one of the key personnel who will be responsible for documentation).

## 7 Key Personnel

Proposals should indicate the key personnel who will be directly involved in the work, together with their envisaged role. The relevant expertise of each individual to this assignment should be clearly outlined (full CVs are required).

### 7.1 Skills, Experience and Competencies

The team should have:

- a. Knowledge of challenge funds and grant mechanisms;
- b. Knowledge of publicly funded government initiatives;
- c. Experience in evaluating similar types of programmes/models, including any experience with SME development programmes, specifically in the retail sector;
- d. Knowledge in the field of innovation and research in the context of market development,
- e. Deep SME development sector and value chain knowledge;
- f. Financial sector knowledge and experience;
- g. Knowledge of on-lending project models for SMEs in South Africa;
- h. Experience evaluating programme management, governance and regulatory processes from an institutional perspective;
- i. Understanding of the economic development dynamics and unemployment in low- and middle-income countries; and
- j. Key personnel to have a minimum of a 3 year-graduate degree or relevant experience in the field of Economics/ Finance/ Public Policy/ Social Science, Enterprise Development.

## 8 Evaluation Criteria

The successful applicant will be awarded the contract for the duration of the service requirements and will be selected based on the following two-stage process which is highlighted in the table below.

STAGE	DESCRIPTION	MINIMUM THRESHOLD
One	The Proposals will be assessed based on the criteria below and bidders that meet the minimum threshold of 75% will be invited to participate in Stage 2.	75%
Two	Selected bidders will be required to attend a session whereby they will present their proposal to a panel and thereafter will be interviewed. Those bidders reaching a minimum threshold of 75% for the interview will be considered for appointment.	75%

It should be noted that the stages are considered to be separate processes and, as a result, the score from Stage One will not be used in Stage Two to calculate a total overall score. These two stages are mutually exclusive and will be treated as such in the appraisal.

## 8.1 Stage One

In addition to the proposal, the bidder is expected to submit the following:

No.	ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS
1.	Resource Matrix, clearly showing the role, qualification and number of hours allocated to each team member for the completion of the project (this must be in the Resource Matrix template provided)
2.	Team Experience Matrix, clearly showing the experience of proposed team as per the stipulated requirements (this must be in the Team Experience template provided)
3.	Project schedule/timeline (this must be in the Project Timeline template provided)
4.	Updated 3 to 5-page CV of each of the individuals showing qualifications, expertise and experience.

All annexures as listed in table above must be submitted with the proposal.

The Evaluation criteria are discussed in the table below:

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1.	<p><b>Qualifications</b> A minimum of a 3 year-graduate degree in the field of Economics/Monitoring and Evaluation/Public Policy/Social Science (i.e. Bachelors, Honours, Masters, PHD)</p> <p><b>Qualification(s)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postgraduate Degree = 5</li> <li>• Degree = 4</li> <li>• Diploma =3</li> <li>• Certificate = 2</li> <li>• Matric qualification = 1</li> </ul>	10

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT
2.	<p><b>Knowledge of enterprise development support programmes and facilitating market access for SMMEs, with a specific focus on the retail sector</b>  <i>(Based on project team member with the highest level of stated experience for this item – this individual needs to be clearly identified in the proposal).</i></p> <p>List projects undertaken, crossed referenced in the proposal and CVs of individual members. Tabulate at least 3 assignments or pieces of work that show experience in these areas.</p> <p><b>Experience:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9+ years = 5</li> <li>• 7 to 8 years = 4</li> <li>• 5 to 6 years = 3</li> <li>• 3 to 4 years = 2</li> <li>• &lt; 3 years = 1</li> </ul>	20
3.	<p><b>Experience and understanding of the roll-out of manufacturing, light infrastructure and wholesale &amp; retail projects in South Africa or similar contexts</b>  <i>(Based on project team member with the highest level of stated experience for this item – this individual needs to be clearly identified in the proposal).</i></p> <p>List projects undertaken, crossed referenced in the proposal and CVs of individual members. Tabulate at least 3 assignments or pieces of work for each individual team member that shows experience in these areas.</p> <p><b>Experience:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9+ years = 5</li> <li>• 7 to 8 years = 4</li> <li>• 5 to 6 years = 3</li> <li>• 3 to 4 years = 2</li> <li>• &lt; 3 years = 1</li> </ul>	15
4.	<p><b>Experience using mixed methods in evaluations</b> <i>(This will be evaluated based on project team members with the most experience in mixed methods. These individuals need to be clearly identified in the experience matrix template).</i></p> <p>List projects undertaken, crossed referenced in the proposal and CVs of individual members. Tabulate at least 3 assignments or pieces of work for each individual team member that shows experience in these areas.</p> <p><b>Experience:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9+ years = 5</li> <li>• 7 to 8 years = 4</li> <li>• 5 to 6 years = 3</li> <li>• 3 to 4 years = 2</li> <li>• &lt; 3 years = 1</li> </ul>	20

No.	EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT
5.	<p><b>Experience in producing high quality written outputs i.e. reports, articles, briefs, etc. (service provider must be able to adequately synthesize the findings of the evaluation for learning purposes).</b>  <i>(Based on project team member with the highest level of stated capability for this item – this individual needs to be clearly identified in the proposal).</i></p> <p>The proposal must include a section that lists and describes the relevant written outputs published in the last five years, the audience it was intended for, as well as where it was published, must be included. This is also to be included in the Team Experience Matrix.</p> <p><b>Experience:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9+ outputs = 5</li> <li>• 7 to 8 outputs = 4</li> <li>• 5 to 6 outputs = 3</li> <li>• 3 to 4 outputs = 2</li> <li>• &lt; 3 outputs = 1</li> </ul>	15
6.	<p><b>Approach: Relevance, quality and creativity of the technical approach to the research study.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal addressed all areas of the requirements and proposed value-add items such as interesting approaches for undertaking the project. Timeframes for implementation are in line with the requirements of the ToR = 5</li> <li>• Proposal addressed all of the requirements. Confident that the project can be implemented. Timeframes for implementation are in line with the requirements of the ToR = 4</li> <li>• Proposal addressed most of the requirements. The project can be implemented but not at the ideal quality. Timeframes for implementation are in line with the requirements of the ToR = 3</li> <li>• Proposal partially addressed some areas of the requirements, but overall not convincing – i.e. scope not fully addressed or timeframes are misaligned to ToR requirement = 2</li> <li>• Not likely to address the needs of the assignment = 1</li> </ul>	20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>Total Technical Minimum Threshold to proceed to the interview stage</b>	<b>75.0%</b>

The service providers that achieve the minimum threshold in Stage One will be called for an interview. Failure to meet a minimum total interview threshold of 75% will result in disqualification of bidder.

## 8.2 Stage Two

Those bidders that meet the minimum threshold in Stage One will attend an interview, which will include delivering a presentation to the evaluation panel. This process will be used to verify the following:

- Demonstration of knowledge and skills (Weight: 40%)
- Demonstration of the understanding of the ToR (Weight: 60%)

The two will be evaluated as follows:

NO	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GUIDELINES FOR CRITERIA APPLICATION	WEIGHT
	Demonstration of knowledge and skills	5 = Excellent (Demonstrated capability is significantly above the expected capability level) 4 = Good (Demonstrated capability exceeds the expected capability level) 3 = Average (Demonstrated capability meets the expected capability level) 2 = Below Average (Demonstrated capability is below the expected capability level) 1 = Poor (Demonstrated capability is significantly below the expected capability level)	40%
	Demonstration of the understanding of the ToR and responsiveness of the proposal to the ToR	5 = Excellent (Demonstrated capability is significantly above the expected capability level) 4 = Good (Demonstrated capability exceeds the expected capability level) 3 = Average (Demonstrated capability meets the expected capability level) 2 = Below Average (Demonstrated capability is below the expected capability level) 1 = Poor (Demonstrated capability is significantly below the expected capability level)	60%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>
	<b>Minimum threshold</b>		<b>75%</b>

Those bidders reaching a minimum threshold of 75% will be considered for price and B-BBEE evaluation based on the 80/20 principle.

Note that proposals received in response to these terms of reference shall be valid for a period of 90 (ninety) days from the closing date of the bid.