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**FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

**QUESTION NO. 2689**

**DATE OF PUBLICATION IN INTERNAL QUESTION PAPER: 03 DECEMBER 2021 (INTERNAL QUESTION PAPER NO. 31)**

**Ms H Ismail (DA) to ask the Minister of Health:**

With regard to the Digital Vibes tender, (a) what was the extent of vetting processes that were conducted by his department and (b) were the qualifications of team members and individuals in Digital Vibes vetted?

**NW3202E**

# REPLY:

The vetting conducted entailed the following:

1. (i) Checked if Digital Vibes is fit to do business with the department by assessing its capability and capacity through functionality evaluation which was part of terms of reference.
	1. Checked if the Digital Vibes operates in the required business sector in so far as their registration with CSD.
	2. Checked the legitimacy by verifying its existence through the Central Supplier Database, how long they have existed, that they are actively trading, and their financial status.
	3. The department also checked if Digital Vibes and its directors/shareholders were not restricted to do business with the State through the National Treasury tender defaulters register.
	4. The department relied on the information certified by the bidder on the Declaration of bidder’s past supply chain management practices, standard bidding document 8 (SBD 8). Question 4.1 SBD 8 ask the bidder or any of its directors if they listed on the National Treasury Database of restricted suppliers as companies or person prohibited from doing business with the public sector. Question 4.2 of the same SBD 8 ask the bidder or its directors if they listed on the register of tender defaulters in terms of section 29 of the prevention and combating of corrupt activities Act (Act No. 12 of 2004).
	5. The department also checked if the bank account number belong to Digital Vibes and not individual through bank verification on the Central Supplier Database.
	6. The department made use of the declaration of interest, standard bidding document 4 (SBD 4) to be completed by the bidder and the bidder had to sign the declaration form certifying that the information furnished is true and correct. Paragraph 2.9 of the SBD 4 ask the bidder if “Do you, or any person connected with the bidder, have any relationship (family, friend, other) with person employed by the State and who may be involved with the evaluation and or adjudication of this bid”.
2. The General Condition of Contract (GCC), which forms part of the standard bidding document issued to bidders’ states on paragraph 1.13 that “Fraudulent practice” means a misrepresentation of facts in order to influence a procurement process or the execution of a contract to the detriment of any bidder. In this case, qualifications of team members and individuals of Digital Vibes were not vetted. Bidders are bound by the GCC that their submission is truthful in all aspects and that any misrepresentation are dealt with in line with Preferential Procurement Regulations 2017. If after award it becomes apparent that the bidder misrepresented facts on the submission of their bidding documents the contract may cancelled which may lead to the entity being restricted from doing business with the state for a specified period.

END.
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