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1. Background Information and Rationale

The core business of the Corporate Services Centre (CSC), which is situated in the Department of the Premier, is the delivery of corporate services to the various Western Cape Government (WCG) line function departments.

As part of the Modernisation Programme, the initial problem statement related to whether a separate corporate services unit would be feasible; and if so, the design of its organisational form, its functional content and the organisational establishment aligned to it. Related analysis conducted highlighted the division of the roles and the responsibilities of the various stakeholders in respect of the recommended functional areas. This assessment, through the resultant Modernisation Blueprint, recommended the adoption of a new organisation and establishment (including the institutionalisation of a CSC within the Department of the Premier), effective 1 April 2010. This culminated in the approval of the assessment by Cabinet and the implementation of the WCG Policy for the rendering of Corporate Services.

Subsequent to the implementation of this policy, Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were developed and signed between the Head of the CSC and all Heads of Department in the WCG. Each of the signed service level agreements had detailed service schedules attached as annexures. This indicated that 78 services are being delivered by the CSC together with 78 service standards associated with these services. In addition, some services have further developed detailed standard operating procedures. This currently serves as the implementation structure of the SLA and subsequent addendums or amendments.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if the provincial policy for the rendering of corporate services by the CSC has been effectively implemented as per the original policy intent as adopted by Cabinet. It is the intention that this implementation evaluation will subsequently be followed by an impact evaluation (out of scope and subject to a separate procurement process).

3. Focus of the evaluation

3.1 Evaluation questions

The evaluation will respond to the following categories of questions, as a minimum:

3.1.1 Establishment

- Is the location of the CSC in the administration correct: Should the CSC be located within Department of the Premier, Department of Provincial Treasury or be an independent Department?
- Were the resources (budgets and staff) allocated during this period (2010 – 2015) sufficient to enable full implementation of the policy intent and to execute the policy mandates?
• Is the funding model used to determine budget, funding and resource allocations to the CSC appropriate to the policy intent?
• Are the assumptions used when developing the criteria to determine if a functional area qualified as a corporate service still relevant/correct or do they need to change, considering the current functional and policy environment in the WCG?
• Are the correct organisational structures in place to deal with the demand of the corporate services? Is the organisational structure of the CSC appropriate to deal with the demand of the mandate of the CSC?
• Are the organisational structures created in client departments appropriately designed and capacitated to provide the correct service interface between the CSC and client departments
• Are the relevant governance structures and sub-structures as required by the SLAs, Service Schedules and key CSC policy documents established and are they operational/effectively functioning, i.e.:
  o Central IT Committee (CITCOM)
  o ICT Governance Steercom
  o PMSC (People Management Steering Committee)
  o Client Relations Units
  o Combined Assurance Framework
• Is the current scope of work and functional domain still in line with the original intent of the policy (i.e. the additional functions that were added over time – is it in line)?

3.1.2 Roles and responsibilities

• Are the concepts of shared responsibility and accountability understood and bought into by all role players?
• Do the roles and responsibilities as defined in the various governing documents respond to the separation of accountability of AO’s (Accounting Officer’s) in terms of the legislative framework and the responsibility now vested in the CSC as a result of the policy?
• Are the delineation of roles and responsibilities in the various governing documents clear?
• Were these roles operationalised and was it taken (i.e. understood and implemented) up by the CSC and its client departments as per the governing documents?
• Are the execution of the roles and obligations by the various parties measured and monitored?
• Are the demarcation of roles and responsibilities as per the policy and other governing documents still relevant or should changes be effected?

3.1.3 Readiness for implementation

• How effective was the change management process during the implementation?
• Were any pre-implementation assessments conducted and if so, were the resultant recommendations implemented?
• Was an implementation plan developed and executed? How effective was its implementation?
3.1.4. CSC implementation/governing instruments

- Do the key implementation and governing instruments (including SOPs) utilised over the period to be assessed respond fully to the policy intent?
- Are processes in place to monitor compliance with SLAs, service schedules, SOP’s?
- Are reporting structures in place and does reporting take place as envisaged by the relevant blueprint, the CSC Policy and the SLA?
- Was the implementation of the CSC Audit protocol successful?
- How have we utilised ICT systems and applications to implement the policy intent?

3.2 The sources of data and information

The sources of data for the implementation evaluation include, but are not limited to the following:

- Annual Reports of WCG departments
- CSC Assessment and Progress Reports
- Historical Reports: CSC Dashboard
- Modernisation Blueprints (ex. IT Services Blueprint)
- SLAs (Service Level Agreements)
- SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures)
- CSC Audit Protocol
- Internal Audit Quality Assurance Review Report
- Client Satisfaction surveys/questionnaires
- Monthly/Quarterly progress reports to HODs (Head of Departments) and to Audit Committees
- Strategic HR Assessments
- IT Governance Maturity Assessments (COBIT maturity levels)
- MPAT (Management Performance Assessment Tool)
- DoTP Budgets and financial reports
- Departmental budgets at time of corporatisation
- QPR’s (Quarterly Performance Report’s) over the period
- DoTP Annual Performance Plans and Strategic Plan
- CSC Circulars
- Circulars issued by the DG
- CSC Policy documents
- CSC Guideline documents

3.3 Potential users of the evaluation

- Provincial Cabinet
- Provincial Parliament
- Provincial Top Management (PTM)
- Executive Management of the WCG
- Department of the Premier
- Centre of Government Departments (e.g. DPSA)
- Departments (National and Provincial)
- Oversight Bodies (e.g. AGSA)
- Academia
3.4 Scope of the evaluation

3.4.1 Time period under review

The evaluation will cover the period since the inception of the implementation of the provincial policy for the rendering of corporate services by the Corporate Services Centre in October 2010 until 31 March 2015.

3.4.2 Themes covered

- Corporatisation of services within the WCG
- Design features of the corporatisation of services
- Implementation process of corporatisation
- Funding Model
- Level of implementation of the IT Services Blueprint
- Best practices relating to WCG Client departments and the CSC
- Levels of monitoring and evaluation of the CSC

3.4.3 Geographic coverage

3.4.3.1 Provincial

The evaluation will cover the following 13 WCG provincial departments, including their respective regional offices:

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Community Safety
- Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport
- Department of Economic Development and Tourism
- Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning
- Department of Human Settlements
- Department of Local Government
- Department of the Premier
- Department of Provincial Treasury
- Department of Social Development
- Department of Transport and Public Works
- Department of Health
- Western Cape Education Department

4. Evaluation Plan

4.1 Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- Inception Report by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal including a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report;
• Develop a draft theory of change and logical framework for the intervention. The evaluation should test this theory of change and then at the end make suggestions for changes;
• Literature review;
• Benchmark report;
• Report structure, final data collection instruments and other tools;
• Analysis plan;
• Field work report;
• Draft evaluation report for review, full and in the 1/5/25 format;
• An engagement with the stakeholders to discuss the draft report;
• The final evaluation report, both full and in the 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic formats;
• Proposed changes to the intervention design if needed – if the design is found to be inadequate, then the evaluators will need to suggest revisions to the logic model and the theory of change. The department may then need to redesign the intervention. This may be part of the final report;
• Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected; and
• A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results.

5. Methodology/Evaluation approach

The service provider should propose an appropriate evaluation methodology to respond to the evaluation questions in section three (3) above. The evaluator is expected to use both quantitative and qualitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions. The approach should consider the National Evaluation System and its related National Evaluation Policy Framework and the institutionalisation thereof though the Provincial Evaluation Plans.

Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

5.1 Document Review

Collect data recording the implementation and monitoring based on the monitoring reports of the Corporate Services Centre. Sources should include the monitoring reports, document reviews, surveys and related implementation reports as listed in section 3.2.

5.2 Literature review/benchmarking

Do a high level comparative literature review of the rendering of corporate services by the Western Cape Government and another province and country implementing a similar approach and analyse evidence from the literature reviews. This should result in and inform a suggested analytical framework to be used in the evaluation, the report outline and the development of the research instruments.

5.3 Interviews

All 13 provincial departments. This will include interviews with a representative sample with the following stakeholders (but not limited to):
- Cabinet members
- Provincial Heads of Departments and members of departmental executive management
- CSC EXCO
- DotP EXCO
- Departmental Heads of Communication
- Client Relationship Unit Managers
- Chairpersons of Audit Committees
- ERMCOs (Enterprise Risk Management Committees)
- DITCOMs (Departmental Information Technology Committees)
- Departmental Bursary Committees
- Departmental Training Committees
- State Information Technology Agency (SITA)
- Auditor-General South Africa (AGSA)
- Bargaining Chambers (Includes: CCPWCP; GPSSBC; PHSDSBC)
- National School of Government
- Office of the State Law Advisor
- DPSA
- National Treasury
- Chairs of Standing Committees in the WC Provincial Parliament

The maximum number of persons per stakeholder group to be interviewed is to be determined and agreed upon between the service provider and Steering Committee at the inception meeting.

5.4 Qualitative and Quantitative analysis

Use qualitative and quantitative analysis on the extent and quality to which the CSC policy is being implemented across the Western Cape Government departments.

5.5 Learning process

Reflective processes with CSC clients and managers and a stakeholder workshop to reflect on the lessons (including the design and the process), emerging findings and how the Corporate Services Centre Policy and its implementation can be strengthened.

5.6 Review of the CSC logical framework
- Review the initial theory of change and the logical framework of the CSC policy and propose changes.
- Recommend how the CSC system and the process should be revised/strengthened. Recommendations should be specific and practical, keeping in mind that an improvement plan will be developed following the evaluation.
6. **Milestones (delivery dates to be completed by bidder)**

The duration of the evaluation is estimated at eight (8) consecutive months. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Delivery date</th>
<th>% Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of comparative literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved report structure, final data collection instruments and analysis plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of field work report</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Consolidated Full Evaluation report for review</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the Final Draft Report full and draft 1/5/25 report (incorporating comments of stakeholders where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved final evaluation reports (approval by Steering Committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-point or audio visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documents (including interview transcripts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Competencies and skills-set

The following Table of generic competencies is required of the service provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/descriptor</th>
<th>Demonstrated ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Overarching considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>South African Public Service and Administration and Provincial departments work in relation to National departments and the operations of a shared services within the Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Ethical conduct</td>
<td>Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Evaluation leadership</strong></td>
<td>Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Evaluation craft</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice</td>
<td>Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation and apply this in high-level, complex and politically sensitive evaluations, in quality, time and budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Research practice</td>
<td>Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods. Systematically gather, analyse and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality and identifying gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Implementation of evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Evaluation planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of change</td>
<td>Develop a clear theory of change with quality programme log frame with good programme logic and indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Managing evaluation</td>
<td>Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives in politically sensitive areas on time and to appropriate standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing and communication</td>
<td>Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, constructive, useful and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
actionable address the key evaluation questions and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other.

8. Evaluation team

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise, their experience, and their respective responsibilities. Please complete in the format as per the table below.

- The team must collectively possess relevant qualification(s), including at least one team member with a Postgraduate Degree.
- The team leader must demonstrate his/her knowledge in leading or managing an evaluation team.
- The team leader should preferably be an expert in Public Sector Management and Governance and have experience of a Shared Services environment.
- The team should include at least one person with experience of conducting work within a government department in each of the following areas: ICT's, Human Resources and Corporate Governance.
- The team must have a track record of conducting implementation evaluations.

Table 3: Evaluation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member Name</th>
<th>Team Member Role</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Team Member availability during the evaluation period</th>
<th>Area of Expertise (ex. ICT’s, Human Resources or Corporate Governance) and number of years’ experience</th>
<th>Summary of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. Management arrangements

9.1 Steering committee

A Steering Committee will comprise of the CSC EXCO and the Chief Director: Strategic Management Information. The role of the Steering Committee will be to govern the achievement of project deliverables and adherence to contractual requirements.

9.2 Peer Reviews

National and provincial peer reviewers will be consulted to support this evaluation.

9.3 Reporting arrangements

The parties will agree on reporting arrangements during the inception meeting.

10. Structure and contents of proposal to be submitted

The tenderer must provide the following details. Failure to provide this will lead to disqualification.

Table 4: Special Conditions of bid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special conditions of bid (Mandatory requirements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The bidding company must attend a compulsory information session on date and time at venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As per Section 8: [Evaluation Team]: Provide details of the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise, their experience, the anticipated role as part of this team and their availability (As per table in par 8). Provide CV’s of the team members that will be working on this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide at least one (1) reference letter, signed by the contactable responsible executive manager (relevant programme manager) which contains the following information:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Proof of conducting an evaluation
  - Quality of evaluation work
  - Completion of the project on time and within budget |
4. Provide:
   - a proposal detailing the approach, design and methodology for the evaluation of a shared service/corporate service as per the ToR
   - Activity-based Project plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities)
   - Quality assurance plan
   - Detailed budget per deliverable as indicated in Table 1 “Payment Schedule” (in South African Rand, including VAT as well as travel and accommodation which is to be added to the Bid Form 3 and all relevant costs)
   - A company schedule which indicates experience and track record in conducting evaluations in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Client</th>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Attachments:
The attachments (including mandatory documents requested above) are to be supplied with the proposal.

The documents required as per the special conditions of the bid should be attached to the completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including an updated tax clearance certificate).

11. Information for service providers

The service provider must provide a proposal following the structure above. Tenders should be submitted by ................... on ..................................In addition short-listed candidates may be asked to come and present their proposals within 28 days of closure of the tender as part of the selection process.

11.1 Key background documents

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting.
11.2 Evaluation criteria for proposals

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two (2) criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competencies outlined in section 7 as demonstrated through:

- The quality of the proposal;
- The service provider’s relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors; and
- Qualifications and expertise of the proposed evaluation team members.

11.3 Pricing requirements

All prices must be fixed and inclusive of VAT and all relevant costs. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in these terms of reference.

11.4 Evaluation of proposals

All bids will be evaluated as follows:

- **Phase 1:** Compliance to all the special conditions of this bid.
  
  Only proposals and quotations that comply with all mandatory requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids will not be considered. The following documentation must be submitted for each bid:
  
  - Documents specified in the tender documents (distributed separately from this ToR); and
  - Any other requirement specified in the ToR.

- **Phase 2:** Functionality test as per BID document provided (threshold is 70%).
  
  The bid evaluation committee will evaluate bid proposals with special attention to criteria described hereunder. The following weighting system will apply and only bidders scoring 70% or more will be eligible to migrate to phase three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORING MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The bidder’s ability to provide an evaluation team with the following competencies:  
  1. Contextual knowledge and understanding of the South African Public Service and Administration and provincial departments  
  2. Evaluation Leadership (leading and managing an evaluation team effectively)  
  3. Evaluation Craft  
  3.1. Evaluative discipline and practice (use | 10 | The points will be allocated as follows:  
  - 0% of weight if no such competency evident in team  
  - 25% of weight if proposed team poorly displays the competency  
  - 50% of weight if |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORING MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td>SCORING MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge base of evaluation, critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation and apply this in complex evaluations in quality, time and budget)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>proposed team displays the competency averagely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Research Practice (design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation’s research needs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% of weight if proposed team displays the competency well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implementation of Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of weight if proposed team displays the competency excellently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Evaluation planning (design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation’s purpose and objectives)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Managing an evaluation project (manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives and outputs on time and to appropriate standards)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Report writing and communication (write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, constructive, useful and actionable)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder’s experience and track record in conducting implementation evaluations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The points will be allocated as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1-&lt;3 years’ experience = 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3-&lt;5 years’ experience = 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5+ years’ experience = 15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder’s methodology and/or approach in demonstrating an understanding of the requirements of this bid. During the consideration of this criteria, the following will be taken into account:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>The points will be allocated as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 0% of weight if methodology/approach is not clear, not relevant or not coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 25% of weight if methodology/approach is poor and not coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of weight if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td>SCORING MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidders ability to provide a resource team throughout the entire evaluation period</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The points will be allocated as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of resources available for the full evaluation period=2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% of resources available for the full evaluation period=5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All resources available for the full evaluation period=10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>methodological approach is average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% of weight if methodology/approach is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of weight if methodology/approach is clear and depicted in logical steps, if the different aspects are integrated and there is coherence between them and if methods adopted are relevant to the WCG environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Phase 3 (if required): Presentation to the Bid Evaluation Committee (threshold is 70%)**

  The evaluation committee retains the right to invite prospective shortlisted bidders to a presentation. The bidders that will migrate to this phase must be available to do a presentation to the Bid Evaluation Committee. The required scope and contents (brief) of the presentation will be communicated to the bidders who migrated to this phase at least 7 days prior to the presentation. Only bidders scoring 70% or more for the presentation will migrate to Phase four.
- **Phase 4**: Allocation of BBBEE points (20) and price (80). This bid is subject to the Preferential Procurement Regulations, 2011. For the purposes of price evaluation only bidders scoring 70% and above during the presentation shall be evaluated for price based on the total value of the bid.

12. **Conditions of contract**

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

13. **Intellectual property**

The Western Cape Government Department of the Premier will own copyright of the products of this evaluation, except prior material brought into the evaluation process or that is owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of the Department of the Premier.

14. **Enquiries**

Regarding the evaluation process and commissioning, please contact Ms Zeenat Ishmail, Chief Director: Strategic Management Information.