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**3373. Ms V van Dyk (DA) to ask the Minister of Water and Sanitation:**

(1) With regard to her reply to question 2064 on 23 June 2015, (a) which companies are currently appointed as professional service providers for her department and (b) what is the appointment period of each professional service provider;

(2) (a) what criteria were used to evaluate each category of professional service provider and (b) which companies were appointed in each category;

(3)(a) how many projects have been awarded to each professional service provider and (b) what is the (i) nature and (ii) rand value of each contract? NW4032E

---00O00---

**REPLY:**

(1) There are a total of companies appointed as Professional Service Providers.

(2)(a)(i) The Department has evaluated all the proposals submitted by the Professional Service Providers in terms of the preferential procurement policy regulations, 2011 pertaining to the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act no.5 of 2000 (PPPFA). All invited bids were evaluated on the basis of functionality as a criterion taking into account quality, reliability, viability and durability of a service and the bidders’ technical capacity and ability to execute a contract.

(2)(a)(ii) When the bids were invited, the following aspects were clearly specified in the bid documents:

* **Evaluation criteria for measuring functionality**

The evaluation criteria may include criteria such as the consultant’s relevant experience for the assignment, the quality of the methodology, the qualifications of the key personnel, transfer of knowledge etc.

**- Weight of each criterion**

The weight that is allocated to each criterion was not generic but determined separately for each bid on a case by case basis.

**- Applicable value**

The applicable values that were utilized when scoring each criterion were objective. As a guide, values ranging from 1 being poor, 2 being average, 3 being poor, 4 being very good and 5 being excellent, were utilized.

**- Minimum qualifying score for functionality**

The minimum qualifying score that was obtained for functionality in order for the bid to be considered further was not generic but specific for each bid. It was determined separately for each bid on a case by case basis. The minimum qualifying score was not prescribed so low that it jeopardized the quality of the service required nor so high that it was restrictive to the extent that it jeopardized the fairness of the SCM system.

(3) Responded to in (1) above.
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