REQUEST FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (EOI)

The HWSETA hereby invites proposals from experience in conducting theory-based, mixed-methods outcome evaluations, including telephonic (CATI) surveys and qualitative methods, to evaluate the outcomes of the HWSETA RPL programme for workers.

EOI particulars	Submission details
Title of the EOI	Outcome Evaluation of the HWSETA Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Programme for Workers – 2026/27
Date of this EOI	03/11/2026
EOI reference number	HWSETA-26/27 EvalResearch-0007
Date and closing date	Expressions of interest must be emailed no later than [18/11/2026, 23.59] with subject line ‘‘[HWSETA-26/27 EvalResearch-0007]”
Service category	Evaluation
Attention and submission address	Expressions of interest must be received no later than **18/11/2026** to: **research@hwseta.org.za** (with attachments not exceeding 100-150 MB). Queries may be directed to research@hwseta.org.za no later than [13/11/2026].

Interested service providers must supply,

A technical proposal that responds to the provided terms of reference, including,

- Understanding of the assignment and context
- Evaluation approach, proposed methodology, data management and protection plan, as well as data analytic approach
- Composition, experience and qualification of the evaluation team
- Workplan and timelines
- Examples of previous recent and relevant evaluations
- Proven work experience in conducting similar evaluations

A financial proposal or costing including a detailed budget to implement the project.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

OUTCOME EVALUATION OF THE HWSETA RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING (RPL) PROGRAMME FOR WORKERS

CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT 3
2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION 4
3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS 4
4. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY 5
   4.1 Evaluation approach 5
   4.2 Study population 5
   4.3 Data collection methods 5
      4.3.1 Survey 6
      4.3.2 Focus group discussions and interviews 6
   4.4 Ethical considerations and data management 7
   4.5 Data analysis and reporting 7
5. COMPETENCY AND EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS (FUNCTIONALITY) 8
6. EXPECTED TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES 11
7. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT 11
8. PRICING 12
10. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS 13
ANNEXURE A: CONSENT IN TERMS OF SECTION 11 OF THE PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION ACT, 2013 (POPIA) 14
ANNEXURE B: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DECLARATION STATEMENT 15

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Health and Welfare Sector Education and Training Authority (HWSETA) is central to advancing South Africa's human capital development agenda in the health and social development sectors. Operating under the Skills Development Act (No. 97 of 1998, as amended), the Skills Development Levies Act (No. 9 of 1999) and the National Skills Development Plan (NSDP) 2030, HWSETA funds and implements interventions to improve the employability, occupational mobility and productivity of employed and unemployed persons.

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)[1] is a key mechanism for redressing past exclusion thus improving the level of skills in the South African workforce. Many workers in the health and social development sectors, particularly in community-based and auxiliary occupations, have acquired substantial competence through work experience but do not hold the formal qualifications that would allow them to register with professional bodies, progress in their careers or access further learning. RPL makes this learning visible and enables it to be assessed and credited against registered qualifications. The policy framework for RPL includes the National Qualifications Framework Act (No. 67 of 2008), which assigns SAQA responsibility for RPL policy; SAQA's National Policy and Criteria for the Implementation of RPL (as amended); DHET's National RPL Coordination Policy; the QCTO's policy on RPL for occupational qualifications; and the White Paper for Post-School Education and Training (2013). The NSDP 2030 and the SETA Grant Regulations provide the basis on which SETAs fund RPL through discretionary grants.

HWSETA funds RPL through its discretionary grant programme, enabling workers in the sector in occupations such as community development workers and child and youth care workers to have their competence assessed against occupational or registered qualifications, with gap training where required.

While HWSETA routinely monitors RPL outputs (enrolments and completions), there is limited systematic evidence on what happens after RPL: whether participants obtain full qualifications and certificates, whether RPL leads to professional registration, recognition by employers, career progression or access to further learning, and which implementation factors explain differences in results.

HWSETA therefore also carries a responsibility to evaluate the outcomes of these interventions. This study forms part of the 2026/27 Monitoring and Evaluation Programme and contributes to indicator 10 of the 2026/27 Annual Performance Plan and provides the mid-term review of the 2025-2030 Strategic Plan to be submitted to the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME).

Table 1: Outcome indicator informed by this evaluation

Outcome indicator	Description	Programme	Output indicator
6-26	Number of workers who obtain full qualifications after successfully completing the RPL programmes funded by the HWSETA by the end of the strategic period	RPL for workers	26.2

The primary outcome of this evaluation is to assess whether workers who complete HWSETA-funded RPL obtain a full qualification. The evaluation will measure this outcome, explain why it is or is not achieved, and provide the SETA with information regarding the activities of learners who have completed HWSETA programmes.

[1] Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) means the principles and processes through which the prior knowledge and skills of a person are made visible, mediated and assessed for the purposes of alternative access and admission, recognition and certification, or further learning and development (NQF Act, No. 67 of 2008).

To this end, HWSETA seeks to conduct the 2026/27 outcome evaluation[2] of the HWSETA RPL programme for workers. The HWSETA hereby invites proposals from competent service providers with proven experience in collecting programme evaluation data using Computer-Assisted Telephonic Interviews (CATI) to implement the 2026/27 RPL Tracer study.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the HWSETA RPL programme has achieved its intended outcomes for participants and employers, to understand the factors that explain these results, and to generate evidence and recommendations to improve the design, implementation and targeting of RPL in the strategic period. The evaluation serves both accountability (reporting on results achieved with public funds) and learning (improving future programming). Specifically, the evaluation must respond to the following objectives:

1. To determine the number and proportion of RPL participants who obtained a full qualification.
2. To assess the extent to which RPL contributed to intermediate outcomes for participants (career progression, changes in job role or earnings, job security, access to further learning, confidence and professional identity) and for employers (workforce compliance, productivity and service quality).
3. To identify the implementation factors (design, targeting, provider and assessor capacity, employer support, quality assurance and certification processes, and funding arrangements) that enabled or constrained the achievement of outcomes.
4. To determine the utilisation of the qualification.
5. To determine learner perception towards the RPL programme.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation must answer the following questions, organised by evaluation criteria. The service provider may refine the questions during inception, with HWSETA's approval, and must translate them into an evaluation matrix specifying indicators, data sources and methods for each question.

Table 2: Evaluation criteria and questions

Criterion	Evaluation question(s)
Relevance and design	a) Is the programme's theory of change plausible, and do its key assumptions hold in practice? b) Are the right people being reached, and are there groups who need RPL but are not accessing it?
Effectiveness: short-term outcomes	a) What number and proportion of RPL completers obtained a full qualification, and what proportion obtained only part qualifications or credits? b) What proportion of enrolled participants completed RPL? c) What proportion of completers have received their certificates, and how long did certification take? d) Where professional or statutory registration is required for the occupation, what proportion of completers have registered? e) Why did participants who did not complete, or did not obtain a full qualification, fall short?

[2] An outcome evaluation assesses whether, and to what extent, an intervention has achieved its intended short- and medium-term results, and the factors that explain this, as distinct from an impact evaluation, which seeks to attribute long-term changes to the intervention using a counterfactual.

Criterion	Evaluation question(s)
Effectiveness: intermediate outcomes	a) What changes have participants experienced since completing RPL in job role, responsibilities, grade or post, earnings, contract type and job security? b) Has RPL enabled participants to access further learning or to articulate into higher-level qualifications? c) How has RPL affected participants' confidence, professional identity and recognition in the workplace? d) What changes have employers observed in workforce compliance, competence, productivity or service quality? e) How has the RPL participants used their qualifications upon completion?
Contribution	a) To what extent can the observed outcomes be credibly attributed to RPL rather than to other factors (e.g. employer promotion policies, other training, labour market conditions)? b) What other factors contributed to or undermined outcomes?
Equity	a) Do access to RPL and outcomes differ by gender, age, disability, province, rural/urban location, language and occupation? b) To what extent does the programme serve its redress objective?
Sustainability	a) Are the outcomes achieved likely to be sustained (e.g. formal recognition by employers and professional council, permanent changes in post or pay)? b) To what extent have providers and employers built lasting capacity to deliver and support RPL?
Lessons and recommendations	a) What lessons can be drawn from more and less successful RPL projects? b) What changes to design, targeting, implementation, monitoring and funding would improve outcomes in the strategic period?

4. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Evaluation approach

HWSETA requires a **theory-based, mixed-methods outcome evaluation**, consistent with the National Evaluation Policy Framework (2019) and DPME evaluation guidelines and standards. The HWSETA will provide the service provider with programme's theory of change and results chain with explicit causal pathways and assumptions to be tested. The service provider must:

- use contribution analysis[3] or a comparable theory-based approach to assess the programme's contribution to observed outcomes, triangulating quantitative and qualitative evidence;
- apply a gender, disability and equity lens throughout data collection and analysis.

4.2 Study population

The evaluation population comprises approximately **1,094 RPL participants** who were RPL assessed and deemed competent by the HWSETA, implemented in three (3) provinces.

4.3 Data collection methods

The proposal must set out a detailed data collection plan. As a minimum, the following methods are expected; the service provider may propose additional or alternative methods with justification.

[3]Contribution analysis is a theory-based approach that tests whether the evidence is consistent with the programme's theory of change and rules out plausible alternative explanations, in order to make a reasoned claim about the programme's contribution to observed outcomes.

Table 3: Minimum data collection requirements

Method	Description	Minimum coverage
Participant survey	Telephone survey (CATI) of RPL learners who completed the programme, on outcomes and experiences. Questionnaire provided by HWSETA; reviewed and scripted by the service provider.	Census sampling approach to reach 1,094 participants on the HWSETA database.
Key informant interviews	Semi-structured interviews with one employer and one HWSETA official (n=2).	One (1) interviews with key stakeholders
Focus group discussions	Discussions with RPL participants, on experiences and outcomes.	6-8 participants

HWSETA will provide the participant and project databases, programme documentation, and introductions to providers and employers. The service provider is responsible for obtaining any additional data, including updated contact details for participants, in compliance with POPIA.

4.3.1 Survey

HWSETA will provide one questionnaire, approximately 20 minutes). The service provider is required to,

- Review and script the questionnaire as issued, with routing logic. Corrections arising from the pilot take effect only with HWSETA's written approval. The service provider may propose supplementary questions of up to five minutes.
- Make at least three call attempts per learner on different days and times (including an evening or Saturday) before classifying a non-contact.
- Trace unreachable learners using alternative methods such as, SMS, WhatsApp, e-mail and social media.
- Obtain consent before interviews and separate consent for recording. Log unsuccessful attempts without recording third parties or non-consenting individuals.
- Report weekly progress by programme and cohort, with achieved valid surveys, non-response, tracing actions and risks to targets.
- Perform quality assurance by back-checking at least 10% of completed interviews.
- Add a consent-to-contact question at the end of the questionnaire: "Would you be open to taking part in a short follow-up focus group discussion about your answers?" Only respondents who answer yes may be invited. Participants are selected at random from this group, balanced by gender, programme and province, and the selection is documented.

The proposal must set out how the service provider will maximise response and assess non-response bias.

4.3.2 Focus group discussions and interviews

- Conduct one focus group discussions (FGDs) with 6-8 respondents each from the survey to understand the "how" and "why" of the survey responses.
- **Key informant interviews:** one employer to assess the outcomes of the programme and one HWSETA official to understand the implementation of the programme.

4.4 Ethical considerations and data management

Participation is voluntary and based on informed consent, recorded at the start of each interview and FGD, with separate consent for audio recording. Learners must be told that taking part has no effect on any future HWSETA funding. Individual answers must never be disclosed to host employers, training providers or anyone outside the study team, and personal identifiers must be kept separate from the analysis data. All personal information and data collection must be handled in compliance with the Protection of Personal Information Act (No. 4 of 2013): stored encrypted and access-controlled, used only for this study, and returned or destroyed at the end of the contract, with written confirmation, subject to the agreed audit and retention arrangements as outlined in the data management plan submitted with the proposal. The service provider must submit a cleaned and validated dataset using HWSETA's approved templates and metadata conventions, capturing all variables required by the analytical framework. To ensure consistency and usability, the service provider must:

- Store personal information securely (encrypted, access-controlled and backed up), keep identifiers separate from analytical data and submit a plan covering transfer, retention, handover and secure deletion.
- apply a structured, standardised coding system, with consistent pre-defined codes for all categorical variables;
- label all variables clearly and provide a detailed codebook, including variable descriptions, value labels, derived-variable definitions and notes on missing data;
- implement quality control throughout collection, including independent CATI script testing by at least two people. Pilot learners form part of the census; valid pilot interviews count as completed interviews if they meet the final approved instrument and quality requirements.
- re-interview affected pilot learners where substantive instrument changes occur, range and routing checks, duplicate and date-consistency checks, and cross-referencing against certification records.

4.5 Data analysis and reporting

The HWSETA will provide an analytical framework to be used to analyse findings based on the scope of data collected. Analysis must follow the approved framework; deviations require written HWSETA agreement. As a minimum, the analytical framework must be used by the service provider to:

- map every objective and study question to the questionnaire items, derived variables, indicators and analytical methods that will answer it (an analysis matrix);
- specify disaggregations and minimum subgroup reporting thresholds, including suppression or aggregation where small cells risk identification or unreliable interpretation;
- Present results by programme, NQF level, gender, age, disability, province and learner pathway where coverage permits. Account for different elapsed times since certification.
- specify appropriate descriptive statistics and uncertainty measures, tests of association and multivariate analysis where sample size and data quality permit, and explicitly report non-response. Qualitative evidence must not be weighted.
- specify how qualitative data will be analyzed and integrated with the survey findings;
- State non-response and comparability limitations and distinguish association or perceived contribution from causal impact.

Before fieldwork, HWSETA will also approve indicator definitions, competence-improvement measurement rules and acceptable supporting evidence. Distinguish self-reported improvement from corroborated or formally assessed improvement in indicator calculations.

The service provider is expected to submit consenting recordings linked to study IDs, a fieldwork technical report, documented validation checks and an evidence register supporting indicator calculations. Personal identifiers must not appear in public reports or de-identified analytical materials. Qualitative findings must not be presented as representative of the population. The service provider will be expected to submit de-identified transcripts of recorded discussions and detailed de-identified notes of any approved unrecorded alternatives, and a documented thematic analysis integrated with the survey findings.

5. COMPETENCY AND EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS (FUNCTIONALITY)

- Proposals that meet all mandatory requirements (Section 8) will be scored against the criteria below. **A minimum of 80 out of 100 points** is required to proceed to price and specific goals. Every criterion is scored from the information in the proposal, the completed team tables and the attached documents.
- Service providers may be required to present their proposals as part of the evaluation process.
- Where Artificial Intelligence (AI) was used, service providers are required to declare; this requires a transparent disclosure of how and where AI tools were used, Annexure B.

Table 4: Functionality scoring sheet

Criterion	Scoring	Points
1. Organisational capacity (25 points)		
1.1 CATI and online survey system	Each of the following five functions scores 2 points if the proposal fully describes it, including the specific system or procedure used; otherwise, 0: • management and secure storage of personal information in line with POPIA, including back-ups (2) • CATI system and software to be used (2) • recording, labelling and provision of audio files (2) • quality control process (back-checks and data validation) (2) • online, SMS and WhatsApp survey capability (2)	10
1.2 Previous experience with CATI surveys	Capability to handle high-volume calling while maintaining high data accuracy, scored on the largest single CATI project shown in a reference letter or in Table C (Sample size column); • fewer than 500 respondents in one project= 2 between 500 and 1, 000 respondents in one project= 3 • greater than 1, 000 respondents in one project= 5	5

1.3 Fieldworkers / CATI operators
(Table A)
	At least three operators/fieldworkers listed, each speaking at least three official languages fluently and with at least three years' CATI experience. If this minimum is not met, scores 0.
	Scored on the weakest operator listed:
	• ***Languages:***
	all speak 3 = 2 points;
	all speak 4 or more = 5 points
	• ***CATI experience:***
	all have 3 years = 2 points;
	all have 4 or more years = 5 points
		10

2. Experience of the project team (15 points)		

Criterion	Scoring	Points
2.1 Previous experience in implementing similar projects. (Table C)	Confirmation that your organisation has a track record of at least five (5) years in implementing similar projects. This is to be supported by at least two (2) references and a project list 5 or more projects = 5 points 3-4 or more projects = 3 points; 2 project= 2 points; 1 project= 1 point; none = 0	5
2.2 Core team (Table B)	Each of the four roles (questionnaire scripter, data analyst, qualitative researcher / FGD facilitator, report writer) scores on years of experience in that role: 3–4 years = 1 point; 5 or more years = 2.5 points; less than 3 years or role not filled = 0. Points for the four roles added together.	10
3. Qualifications of the project team (25 points)		
3.1 Team leader (1 person)	Social Sciences-related field, Statistics, Monitoring and Evaluation, Development Studies, Demography, Economics or health-related field Master's degree = 5 points; doctoral degree = 10 points; below master's degree = 0	10
3.2 Core team (at least 2 people from Table B, one of them the data analyst)	Social Sciences-related field, Statistics, Development Studies, Demography, Economics or health-related field Honours degree = 5 points; master's degree or higher = 10 points; below honours degree = 0.	10
Fieldworkers, at least 2 from Table A	Fieldworkers; Matric and above= 5points Below matric= 0points	5
4. Organisational track record (35 points)		
4.1 Reference letters	At least two valid reference letters for research or evaluation services, dated between 2018 and 2026, at least one of them for work completed in the past 36 months = 10 points; otherwise, 0 (and 4.2 and 4.3 also score 0)	10
4.2 CATI data collection	At least one valid letter confirms that the service provider used telephonic interviews/CATI for data collection = 10 points	15
4.3 Tracer or labour market research	At least one valid letter confirms a tracer study, evaluation, labour market or SETA research = 10 points	10
Total	**Minimum [80]**	**100**

Qualifications: certified copies are required, with certification not older than six months. International qualifications must be verified by SAQA, with a copy of the verification letter. Missing qualifications/uncertified/older than 6months certified qualifications score 0.

Reference letters are valid only if they are on the client's letterhead, dated and signed, name the specific study undertaken, and state the signatory's organisation, position and contact details

(including an e-mail address). HWSETA may contact referees: a letter is invalid if the referee does not respond within five working days or does not confirm it.

Team tables A-C must be copied into the proposal and completed, with a CV attached for every person listed. A table that is missing or incomplete scores 0 for the related criterion. Listed team members may not be replaced after submission without HWSETA's written approval.

Table A: Fieldworkers / CATI operators (at least three)

Name and surname	Title	Official languages spoken fluently	Years of CATI experience

Table B: Team leader and core team

Role	Name and surname	Years of relevant experience on tracer studies or comparable survey assignments	Years in this role
Team leader			
Questionnaire scripter			
Data analyst			
Qualitative researcher / FGD facilitator			
Report writer			

Table C: projects undertaken by the team leader. List up to ten research or evaluation projects completed between 2018 and 2026 in which the team leader took part, starting with the most recent. For each project give the type of study (tracer, impact, evaluation, survey or other), the methods used (e.g. CATI, FGDs, interviews), the team leader's role (lead or team member), and a contactable reference (name, telephone and e-mail). A project counts towards criterion 2.1 only if every column is completed, including a contactable reference, and the project also appears in the team leader's CV. HWSETA may contact the references listed.

Table C: Projects undertaken by the team leader (2018–2026, maximum ten)

#	Project title	Client	Year	Type of study	Methods used	Sample size	Reference
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

Add rows as needed, up to ten projects.

6. EXPECTED TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

The duration of the evaluation will be approximately five months, from 18 January 2027 to 31 May 2027. The service provider must propose a detailed implementation plan that meets these dates, including the resources (e.g. number of CATI operators) needed to complete fieldwork in the available window.

Table: Deliverables

Phase	Deliverable	Format
Inception	**Inception report:** (understanding of the assignment, data collection plan, contact protocol, FGD recruitment plan, quality assurance, risk plan, work plan); methodology, sampling design and weights; ethics and data protection plan; analysis plan; risk and mitigation plan; detailed work plan, data management plan (secure transfer, storage, retention, handover and deletion of learner data). **Reviewed and scripted questionnaire**, with a Word version	MS Word
Data collection	**Datasets** (raw and cleaned) and codebook; **audio recordings**; **transcripts** and coding framework; **Fieldwork report and data:** response rates and limitations; cleaned, weighted and labelled survey dataset with codebook; qualitative transcripts and coding framework; audio recordings.	MS Word; Excel / SPSS; MP3
Reporting	Draft report with disaggregated findings, with detailed limitations, analysis files and tables.	MS Word
	One virtual validation session with HWSETA; presentation and comments record	MS PowerPoint; MS Word
	Final report (1/5/35), including conclusions and evidence-based recommendations; executive summary; final datasets and syntax; response matrix; presentation; 1–2-page infographic	MS Word; PDF; MS PowerPoint

7. ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

The Senior Evaluation and Impact Assessment Officer will coordinate communication between HWSETA, its stakeholders and appointed service provider, consolidate comments, facilitate approvals and manage quality of project delivery. Instrument approval, material scope changes, deliverable acceptance and final sign-off must be given by the HWSETA M&E Manager who is responsible for the overall quality of the reports produced and for managing the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). The service provider remains responsible for project management and the quality of its outputs. HWSETA will make relevant documentation and administrative data available to the service provider, subject to the data protection provisions of this ToR. All intellectual property, datasets, recordings and reports produced under this assignment remain the property of HWSETA and may not be used or published by the service provider without HWSETA's written permission.

Attend progress meetings at least every two weeks during fieldwork and as reasonably required at other stages.

To enhance the quality and credibility of the evaluation, the HWSETA applies a quality support process that systematically assesses the ToR, the submitted proposal, the inception report, the analytical framework, the data collection tools, the data collected and all reports. The service provider must therefore:

- Maintain traceability from source data, calculations and findings. Clearly separate observed, estimated, self-reported and corroborated results.
- Apply internal review by a team member who did not draft the deliverable. Check data quality, calculations, consistency and confidentiality.
- Submit a response matrix with each revised report and explain how comments were addressed.
- Notify HWSETA within two working days of material risks to ethics, data quality, survey targets or timelines.
- Provide professionally edited reports distinguishing findings, conclusions and actionable recommendations.

HWSETA will assess deliverables against the agreed scope, valid survey totals, analytical framework and evidence standards. The provider may not use or publish confidential data without written authorization. All datasets, codebooks, scripts, recordings, transcripts and reports produced under this assignment remain the intellectual property of HWSETA

8. PRICING

The proposed project price must be **inclusive of VAT** and must be valid for at least 90 days from the closing date.

- HWSETA may require a breakdown of rates for any priced item, and service providers are required to provide it.
- HWSETA reserves the right to negotiate the selection or prioritisation of deliverables in line with the contract price.
- Payment will be made against deliverables approved by HWSETA, in line with the payment schedule agreed at contracting.

The following table must be used for the quotation; additional detail (including daily rates and the number of days per team member) may be provided in the service provider's own format in addition to (not instead of) this table.

Table 6: Pricing schedule (all amounts inclusive of VAT)

Activity / deliverable	Cost (R)
Inception report	
Scripting of the questionnaire	
Fieldworker training and piloting	
Telephonic interviews, 1,094 RPL workers	
Virtual key informant interviews, n=2 (employer + HWSETA official)	
Virtual two focus group discussions, n=1	
Transcription, translation, data cleaning and submission of datasets	
Fieldwork report	

Activity / deliverable	Cost (R)
Analysis, draft and final evaluation report	
TOTAL COST (incl. VAT)	

10. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

The following documents and information must be submitted with the proposal. Proposals that do not include all mandatory documents will be disqualified and will not be evaluated for functionality.

1. Technical proposal, including methodology, draft analytical approach, FGD recruitment plan, work plan and the completed team tables A-C (Section 5).
2. CVs of the team leader and all listed team members, and certified copies of qualifications, not older than six months (SAQA verification for foreign qualifications).
3. Company registration documents, proof of registration on the National Treasury Central Supplier Database (CSD), business address and contact person.
4. The service provider's business address and contact person (name, e-mail address and telephone number).
5. Reference letters meeting the requirements in Section 5.
6. Completed pricing schedule (Section 8).
7. Signed POPIA consent form (Annexure A).
8. AI declaration Statement (Annexure B).

ANNEXURE A: CONSENT IN TERMS OF SECTION 11 OF THE PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION ACT, 2013 (POPIA)

For the Health and Welfare Sector Education and Training Authority (HWSETA) to consider the applicant's response to this advertisement to become a service provider of the HWSETA, it will be necessary for the HWSETA to process certain personal information which the service provider may share with the HWSETA for the purpose of the bid.

Access to personal information and purpose specification: The HWSETA will process the service provider's personal information in accordance with its Privacy Policy, for the purposes of assessing the service provider's submission in relation to the advertised EOI and of assessing current services required by the HWSETA. The HWSETA may also share the service provider's personal information with third parties within the Republic of South Africa, including to carry out verification and background checks. The service provider acknowledges that the HWSETA's authorised verification agent(s) and service providers will access personal information and conduct background screening.

Consent: By ticking "Yes" and signing below, the service provider voluntarily consents to the HWSETA, as the Responsible Party in terms of POPIA, collecting, processing, storing and verifying its personal information for purposes related to the evaluation, adjudication and administration of this bid submission.

The service provider understands that this processing may include, where necessary, the disclosure of personal information to authorised third parties or service providers engaged by the HWSETA strictly for these purposes. The HWSETA will ensure that all personal information is processed lawfully, stored securely and used only for the purpose for which it was collected, in accordance with POPIA and the HWSETA's Privacy Policy.

The service provider acknowledges that it may withdraw its consent in writing at any time by notifying the HWSETA at research@hwseta.org.za. However, it understands that withdrawal of consent may limit the HWSETA's ability to evaluate or process the bid submission. All personal information will be retained only for as long as necessary to fulfil the purposes outlined above and will thereafter be securely destroyed or de-identified in accordance with applicable legislation.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Supplier name	Date	Signature

ANNEXURE B: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DECLARATION STATEMENT

Artificial Intelligence Tool: [description of tools used];
[Heading]: [description of AI use in that stage of the work/proposal]