



Call for proposals: Developing case studies for the C.A.P.E. partnership

C.A.P.E. is looking for a consultant to research and write up a set of 20 case studies illustrating the achievements made by and challenges faced by the partnership programme, as part of the C.A.P.E. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. The work will begin in mid-February 2009 and should be completed by the end of April 2009.

1. Background

Cape Action for People and the Environment (C.A.P.E.) is a partnership of government and civil society aimed at conserving and restoring the biodiversity of the Cape Floristic Region and the adjacent marine environment, while delivering significant benefits to the people of the region. The C.A.P.E. Coordination Unit (CCU) is hosted by the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) and its fynbos biome programme.

C.A.P.E. has 23 signatory partners - government departments, municipalities, non-governmental and community-based organisations and conservation agencies. All these organisations and a broader base of stakeholders are united in a common strategy around biodiversity conservation. See www.capeaction.org.za

A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework for the C.A.P.E. programme measures progress towards an overall programme goal and six strategic objectives – relating to effective protection, wise regulation, integrated management, sustainable benefits, capable institutions and shared knowledge. Where possible, quantitative indicators are used to measure progress. Where available information is qualitative rather than quantitative, the case studies will illustrate progress and challenges.

The framework was developed in consultation with C.A.P.E. partners between 2006 and 2008. In 2009, it will be used to provide a snapshot of the state of CFR biodiversity so as to inform the partnership about its progress towards its 2020 goal and to guide its strategic planning. Thereafter it will be used every five years as a self assessment tool.

2. Scope of work

It is envisaged that the consultant will provide the following services:

- a) Meet with the CCU to be briefed on the 20 proposed case studies (see Annexure 1), their content, the contact people and background documentation.
- b) Reach agreement in discussion with the CCU on issues relating to the style, structure and length (proposed 750 – 1 000 words each) of the case studies.

- c) Develop an initial draft of each case study, based on telephonic interviews and review of documents obtained from the CCU and contact people.
- d) Submit the draft of each case study for review by the CCU and contact people, at a rate of 2-3 case studies per week.
- e) Develop a final draft of each case study based on the review comments. (Finalising earlier case studies can occur simultaneously with drafting later case studies.)
- f) Make the final case studies available to the CCU as MSWord documents, for formatting by the CCU.

It is anticipated that each case study will take approximately 8 hours to complete, including all the stages of development.

3. Criteria for selection

A proven track record in writing/materials development is essential, with examples of writing provided. Good analytical and organisational skills are required. Understanding of biodiversity conservation issues is recommended.

In addition, the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act (No. 5 of 2000) and SANBI procurement process applies to these Terms of Reference. Note that service providers are required to comply with the processes outlined here. Failure to comply will result in disqualification of proposals:

- a) Service providers are required to submit a valid tax clearance certificate with their proposals. In the case that the service provider is not in possession of a valid tax clearance certificate, this should be applied for in good time ahead of the proposal deadline. See Annexure 2 for more information..*
- b) The Standard Bidding Forms (Annexure 3) must be completed and submitted with this proposal.*
- c) The 80/20 point system will be applied in evaluating proposals, where technical merit and price constitute 80 points and ownership by formerly disenfranchised individuals, women and disabled people constitutes 20 points. Evaluation of proposals will be done according to the following criteria. Sufficient information should be provided to allow for evaluation according to these criteria:*

Criteria	Points
Technical merit of proposal (approach, time and deliverables)	30
Qualification, expertise and competencies of service provider	30
Employment Equity	20
Price	20
TOTAL	100

- d) Service providers who fail to score a minimum of 30 points out of a possible 60 points on technical merit and qualification criteria will not be eligible for further consideration.*

4. Contractual arrangements

- The contract will be drawn up between SANBI and the service provider.
- Invoices will be paid for deliverables received as agreed in the contract.
- Invoices must indicate the deliverable produced.
- No upfront payments will be made.

5. Applications

Proposals from suitably qualified and experienced candidates may be submitted via e-mail to Caroline Petersen, C.A.P.E. Learning Network Manager in SANBI's Fynbos Programme, to petersenc@sanbi.org on by 12h00 on Friday 6 February 2009.

Proposals should include:

- A letter of application motivating for the applicant and outlining the proposed approach to the work
- A quote with a budget for the provision of the required services
- A curriculum vitae, including two referees
- Examples of relevant work.

Examples of previous work can be submitted as attachments if they are under 3MB in size, or dropped off in person at the C.A.P.E. Administrator's office: Faslonna Martin, 1st floor, Centre for Biodiversity Conservation, Kirstenbosch National Botanical Garden.

Enquiries can be directed to:

Caroline Petersen
SANBI Fynbos Programme
Email: petersenc@sanbi.org
Tel: (021) 799 8804
Fax: (021) 797 3475

Annexure 1: Case studies for C.A.P.E. M&E Framework

Number	Name of case study	Description	Contacts
<i>Programme Purpose</i>			
1	Case study to illustrate the impact of human activity on flagship species and outline the conservation response	A case study which describes the impact of factors like ecosystem change, habitat loss and climate change on a particular animal or plant species in the fynbos biome, outlining how conservation responses intend to reverse the decline in numbers of that species. Proposal: Table Mountain ghost frog	Guy Palmer – Scientific Services, CapeNature Tel: 021 866 8009 Email: gpalmer@capenature.co.za Andrew Turner, Ernst Baard
<i>SO 1: Effective Protection</i>			
2	Case study to illustrate the importance of meeting legal requirements around alien clearing in managing protected areas	A case study in which a protected area did not burn fire breaks or manage aliens effectively and the consequences when a wildfire broke out, leaving the conservation agency liable for large-scale damages to surrounding landowners' land. Proposal: fire in Kogelberg Nature Reserve	Mark Botha – Director, Conservation Unit, Botanical Society Tel: 021 799 8825 Email: mark@botanicalsociety.org.za Also: Chris Martens, Guy Palmer, Paul Britton, Kerry Purnell www.capenature.co.za
3	Case study to illustrate importance of private investment in stewardship sites	A case study on a private landowner who has invested resources in establishing and managing a contract nature reserve that conserves valuable biodiversity and ecosystem services, ideally also leading to the creation of tourism-related employment. This stewardship agreement is entered into with and supported by CapeNature using state resources, but also involves significant private investment by the landowner, which benefit society as whole by protecting biodiversity. Proposal: Elandskloof Contract Nature Reserve	Kerry Purnell – Coordinator, C.A.P.E. Stewardship Programme Tel: + 27 28 314 0185 Email: kpurnell@capenature.co.za www.capenature.co.za www.capestewardship.co.za http://www.capeaction.org.za/index.php?q=purnell&C=enable&P=0
<i>SO 2: Wise Regulation</i>			
4	Case study to illustrate the impact of having biodiversity information in Spatial Development	This case study shows the value that the mainstreaming of biodiversity into the Spatial Development Framework has added to decision-making processes around land use planning and development applications in a particular municipality. Proposal:	Jeffrey Manuel – Co-ordinator of C.A.P.E. land use planning project Tel: 021 483 2755 Email: jmanuel@pgwc.gov.za http://www.capeaction.org.za/index.php?C=facil&P=2

	Frameworks	Knysna Municipality	
<i>SO 3: Integrated Management</i>			
5	Case study to illustrate collaboration between C.A.P.E partners to achieve conservation goals	A case study on Working for Wetlands, showing the multiple benefits from funding through both DWAF and the Expanded Public Works Programme in terms of short-term job creation and the successful rehabilitation of wetland functioning Proposal: Working for Wetlands in the CFR	Winston Coe – Working for Wetlands, SANBI coe@sanbi.org www.wetlands.snbi.org
6	Case study to illustrate the effectiveness of bio-control measures when used in combination with mechanical clearing of invasive alien weeds	This case study will show the success of the introduction of a particular biocontrol agent, used in combination with physical clearing of stands of alien invasive plants, which has significantly reduced the density and spread of these invasive plants in parts of the Cape Floristic Region. Proposal: gall wasp as a biocontrol agent for <i>Acacia saligna</i> (Port Jackson)	Alan Wood – PPRI / ARC Tel: 021 887 4690 wooda@arc.agric.za http://www.arc.agric.za/home.asp?pid=376
<i>SO 4: Sustainable Benefits</i>			
7	Case study to illustrate progress on the development of a subsistence and small scale fisheries' policy	A case study which outlines the significance of the development of a policy to improve access by previously disadvantaged fisher communities to livelihoods, and reports on the progress made so far and the process of consultation involved. Proposal : PLAAS views on the process so far	Moenieba Isaacs, PLAAS, UWC Tel: 021 959 3721 misaacs@uwc.ac.za
8	Case study to illustrate where innovative pilot projects including those initiated by local and particularly marginalised communities are replicated and rolled out	Case study on Flower Valley to explain the purchase of the farm, establishment of the Trust, training for job creation, growing market, sustainable harvesting guidelines and the expansion of the supply chain network to seven farms – looking at what has and has not been replicable. Proposal: social goals being met at Flower Valley, sustainable harvesting being scaled up	Lesley Richardson, Flower Valley Trust Lesley@flowervalley.org.za www.flowervalley.org.za http://www.capeaction.org.za/index.php?C=bio&P=8 also Roger Bailey, Joan Prins
9-12	Case studies to illustrate work towards social, cultural and economic benefits of biodiversity / natural resources to local	a) Case study on a commercially successful business in which community members have a stake, that is based on sustainable harvesting of natural resources Proposal: Heiveld Co-operative	Bettina Koelle. INDIGO Development and Change Tel: 027 218 1148 bettina@indigo-dc.org www.heiveld.co.za

	and particularly marginalised communities	<p>b) Case study on an agreement concluded in a protected area, so that local communities can benefit from the resources on a sustainable basis Proposal: Tsitsikamma land claims settlement and conflicts over fishing rights</p> <p>c) Case study on the use of conservation and job creation funding to achieve social and conservation goals Proposal: Siyabulela projects of CapeNature in Garden Route - traditional medicine nursery, contractors etc.</p> <p>d) Case study on the impact of protected area expansion on farm communities Proposal: Coleske farm - initially neglected social safeguards and then established a programme to find alternative livelihoods</p>	<p>Elzette Bester – SANParks, People & Parks elzetteb@sanparks.org http://www.biowatch.org.za/docs/benefit_sharing.pdf</p> <p>Alasdair McDonald Tel: 044 802 5300 Email: amacдона@pgwc.gov.za</p> <p>Eleanor Macgregor, Wilderness Foundation Tel: 041 582 1885 Email: eleanor@sa.wild.org</p>
<i>SO 5: Capable Institutions</i>			
13	Case study to illustrate how the C.A.P.E. partnership has provided impetus for partners to take on expanded and clarified biodiversity conservation mandates	Case study to show an example of how the successful execution of elements of the C.A.P.E. programme using donor funding has led to an agreement by one of the signatory partners to the C.A.P.E. Memorandum of Understanding to take on an expanded biodiversity conservation mandate. Proposal: CapeNature business case	<p>Azisa Parker Tel: 021 799 8866 Email: parkera@sanbi.org Also Lala Steyn, Kas Hamman CapeNature submission to pathfinder process</p>
14	Case study to illustrate how partner organisations have benefited from and contributed to C.A.P.E. programme	Case study to show how some of the organisations in the C.A.P.E. partnership have made key inputs into the programme, for example BotSoc's work around conservation stewardship, and have also sharpened the focus of their own Conservation Unit's programme as a result of being part of the broader C.A.P.E. partnership.	<p>Bruce Mackenzie's report to C.A.P.E. 2007 BotSoc's Pathfinder submission 2008 Mark Botha – Director, Conservation Unit, Botanical Society Tel: 021 799 8825 Email: mark@botanicalsociety.org.za</p>
15	Case study to illustrate economic instruments for promoting conservation stewardship and / or sustainable living being developed and applied	Case study on the development of a new area of work in conservation and a particular economic instrument which is having success in promoting it. Proposal: Conservation stewardship programme in CapeNature growing out of a TMF pilot project; progress on municipal rates and national tax rebates	<p>Tracey Cumming, Botanical Society Tel: 021 799 8826 Email: tracey.cumming@gmail.com also Mark Botha, Kerry Purnell, Onno Huyser</p>

<i>SO 6: Shared Knowledge</i>			
16	Case study to illustrate diverse social learning networks that support governance, integration, learning and collaboration across the CFR, and reflect a changing culture of co-operation	Case study to show how a new conservation learning network has emerged from the C.A.P.E. programme via one of the task teams which has expanded its role and supported the creation of a new structure, leveraging funding from partner organisations Proposal: GreenChoice Alliance	Sophie Susman, GreenChoice Alliance Tel: 021 799 8832 Email: ssusman@conservation.org http://www.capeaction.org.za/index.php?C=bio&P=4 also Tatjana van Bormann
17 – 20	Case study to illustrate how research and the development of new tools and approaches has informed planning, policy and decision making	a) Case study on a new approach to preparing products to inform decision-making around land-use planning and decision-making Proposal: C.A.P.E. Fine Scale Plans b) Development of golf course guidelines c) Impact of Working for Water alien clearing and proof of increased water yield on decision-makers d) ?	a) Kerry te Roller Tel: 021 799 8731 Email: teroller@sanbi.org also: Mandy Driver, Jeff Manuel b) Mandy Barnett c) Christo Marais Tel: 021 441 2727 chris@dwaf.gov.za Also Onno Huyser, Hugo van Zyl

Annexure 2

TAX CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS

IT IS A CONDITION OF BID THAT -

The taxes of the successful bidder **must** be in order, or that satisfactory arrangements have been made with South African Revenue Service (SARS) to meet the bidder's tax obligations.

1. In order to meet this requirement bidders are required to complete in full the attached form TCC 001 "Application for a Tax Clearance Certificate" and submit it to any SARS branch office nationally. The Tax Clearance Certificate Requirements are also applicable to foreign bidders / individuals who wish to submit bids.
2. SARS will then furnish the bidder with a Tax Clearance Certificate that will be valid for a period of 1 (one) year from the date of approval.
3. The original Tax Clearance Certificate must be submitted together with the bid. Failure to submit the original and valid Tax Clearance Certificate will result in the invalidation of the bid. Certified copies of the Tax Clearance Certificate will not be acceptable.
4. In bids where Consortia / Joint Ventures / Sub-contractors are involved each party must submit a separate Tax Clearance Certificate.
5. Copies of the TCC001 "Application for a Tax Clearance Certificate" form are available from any SARS branch office nationally or on website www.sars.gov.za

Applications for the Tax Clearance Certificates may also be made via eFiling. In order to use this provision, taxpayers will need to register with SARS as eFilers through the website www.sars.gov.za

Annexure 3

**PREFERENCE POINTS CLAIM FORM IN TERMS OF THE PREFERENTIAL
PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS 2001**

PURCHASES

This preference form must form part of all bids invited. It contains general information and serves as a claim form for Historically Disadvantaged Individual (HDI) preference points as well as a summary for preference points claimed for attainment of other specified goals

NB: BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM, BIDDERS MUST STUDY THE GENERAL CONDITIONS, DEFINITIONS AND DIRECTIVES APPLICABLE IN RESPECT OF EQUITY OWNERSHIP BY HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS (HDIs), AS PRESCRIBED IN THE PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS, 2001.

1. GENERAL CONDITIONS

1.1 The following preference point systems are applicable to all bids:

- the 80/20 system for requirements with a Rand value of up to R500 000; and
- the 90/10 system for requirements with a Rand value above R500 000.

1.2 The value of this bid is estimated to not exceed R500 000 and therefore the 80/20 system shall be applicable.

1.3 Preference points for this bid shall be awarded for:

- (a) Price; and
- (b) Specific contract participation goals, as specified in the attached forms.

1.3.1 The points for this bid are allocated as follows:

1.3.1.1	PRICE	POINTS
		80

1.3.1.2 SPECIFIC CONTRACT PARTICIPATION GOALS

(a) Historically Disadvantaged Individuals:

- | | | |
|-------|---|----|
| (i) | who had no franchise in national elections before the 1983 and 1993 Constitutions | 14 |
| (ii) | who is a female | 4 |
| (iii) | who has a disability | 2 |

(b) Other specific goals (goals of the RDP- plus local manufacture)

- | | |
|------|-------|
| (i) | |
| (ii) | |

- (iii)
- (iv)

Total points for Price, HDIs and other RDP-goals must not exceed 100

Separate Preference Points Claim Forms will be used for the promotion of the specific goals for which points have been allocated in paragraph 1.3.1.2 (b) above.

1.4 Failure on the part of a bidder to fill in and/or to sign this form may be interpreted to mean that preference points are not claimed.

1.5 The purchaser reserves the right to require of a bidder, either before a bid is adjudicated or at any time subsequently, to substantiate any claim in regard to preferences, in any manner required by the purchaser.

2. GENERAL DEFINITIONS

2.1 **“Acceptable bid”** means any bid which, in all respects, complies with the specifications and conditions of bid as set out in the bid document.

2.2 **“Bid”** means a written offer in a prescribed or stipulated form in response to an invitation by an organ of state for the provision of goods, works or services.

2.3 **“Comparative price”** means the price after the factors of a non-firm price and all unconditional discounts that can be utilised have been taken into consideration.

2.4 **“Consortium or joint venture”** means an association of persons for the purpose of combining their expertise, property, capital, efforts, skills and knowledge in an activity for the execution of a contract.

2.5 **“Contract”** means the agreement that results from the acceptance of a bid by an organ of state.

2.6 **“Specific contract participation goals”** means the goals as stipulated in the Preferential Procurement Regulations 2001.

2.6.1 In addition to above-mentioned goals, the Regulations [12.(1)] also make provision for organs of state to give particular consideration to procuring locally manufactured products.

2.7 **“Control”** means the possession and exercise of legal authority and power to manage the assets, goodwill and daily operations of a business and the active and continuous exercise of appropriate managerial authority and power in determining the policies and directing the operations of the business.

2.8 **“Disability”** means, in respect of a person, a permanent impairment of a physical, intellectual, or sensory function, which results in restricted, or lack of, ability to perform an activity in the manner, or within the range, considered normal for a human being.

2.9 **“Equity Ownership”** means the percentage ownership and control, exercised by individuals within an enterprise.

2.10 **“Historically Disadvantaged Individual (HDI)”** means a South African citizen

- (1) who, due to the apartheid policy that had been in place, had no franchise in national elections prior to the introduction of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1983 (Act No 110 of 1983) or the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1993, (Act No 200 of 1993) (“the interim Constitution); and/or
- (2) who is a female; and/or
- (3) who has a disability:

provided that a person who obtained South African citizenship on or after the coming to effect of the Interim Constitution, is deemed not to be a HDI;

- 2.11 **“Management”** means an activity inclusive of control and performed on a daily basis, by any person who is a principal executive officer of the company, by whatever name that person may be designated, and whether or not that person is a director.
- 2.12 **“Owned”** means having all the customary elements of ownership, including the right of decision-making and sharing all the risks and profits commensurate with the degree of ownership interests as demonstrated by an examination of the substance, rather than the form of ownership arrangements.
- 2.13 **“Person”** includes reference to a juristic person.
- 2.14 **“Rand value”** means the total estimated value of a contract in Rand denomination that is calculated at the time of bid invitations and includes all applicable taxes and excise duties.
- 2.15 **“Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs)”** bears the same meaning assigned to this expression in the National Small Business Act, 1996 (No 102 of 1996).
- 2.16 **“Sub-contracting”** means the primary contractor’s assigning or leasing or making out work to, or employing another person to support such primary contractor in the execution of part of a project in terms of the contract.
- 2.17 **“Trust”** means the arrangement through which the property of one person is made over or bequeathed to a trustee to administer such property for the benefit of another person.
- 2.18 **“Trustee”** means any person, including the founder of a trust, to whom property is bequeathed in order for such property to be administered for the benefit of another person.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF HDI EQUITY OWNERSHIP IN AN ENTERPRISE

- 3.1 Equity ownership shall be equated to the percentage of an enterprise which is owned by individuals classified as HDIs, or in the case of a company, the percentage shares that are owned by individuals classified as HDIs, who are actively involved in the management and daily business operations of the enterprise and exercise control over the enterprise, commensurate with their degree of ownership.
- 3.2 Where individuals are not actively involved in the management and daily business operations and do not exercise control over the enterprise commensurate with their degree of ownership, equity ownership may not be claimed.

4. ADJUDICATION USING A POINT SYSTEM

- 4.1 The bidder obtaining the highest number of points will be awarded the contract.

- 4.2 Preference points shall be calculated after prices have been brought to a comparative basis.
- 4.3 Points scored will be rounded off to 2 decimal places.
- 4.4 In the event of equal points scored, the bid will be awarded to the bidder scoring the highest number of points for specified goals.

5. POINTS AWARDED FOR PRICE

5.1 THE 80/20 OR 90/10 PREFERENCE POINT SYSTEMS

A maximum of 80 or 90 points is allocated for price on the following basis:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{80/20} & \mathbf{or} & \mathbf{90/10} \\
 \\
 P_s = 80 \left(1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right) & \text{or} & P_s = 90 \left(1 - \frac{P_t - P_{\min}}{P_{\min}} \right)
 \end{array}$$

Where

- P_s = Points scored for price of bid under consideration
- P_t = Rand value of bid under consideration
- P_{min} = Rand value of lowest acceptable bid

6. Points awarded for historically disadvantaged individuals

- 6.1 In terms of Regulation 13 (2) preference points for HDI's are calculated on their percentage shareholding in a business, provided that they are actively involved in and exercise control over the enterprise. The following formula is prescribed in Regulation 13 (5) (c):

$$NEP = NOP \times \frac{EP}{100}$$

Where

NEP = Points awarded for equity ownership by an HDI

NOP = The maximum number of points awarded for equity ownership by an HDI in that specific category

EP = The percentage of equity ownership by an HDI within the enterprise or business, determined in accordance with the definition of HDI's.

- 6.2 Equity claims for a trust will only be allowed in respect of those persons who are both trustees and beneficiaries and who are actively involved in the management of the trust.
- 6.3 Documentation to substantiate the validity of the credentials of the trustees contemplated above must be submitted.

- 6.4 Listed companies and tertiary institutions do not qualify for HDI preference points.
- 6.5 A consortium or joint venture may, based on the percentage of the contract value managed or executed by their HDI-members, be entitled to preference points in respect of an HDI.
- 6.6 A person awarded a contract as a result of preference for contracting with, or providing equity ownership to an HDI, may not subcontract more than 25% of the value of the contract to a person who is not an HDI or does not qualify for the same number or more preference for equity ownership.

7. BID DECLARATION

7.1 Bidders who claim points in respect of equity ownership must complete the Bid Declaration at the end of this form.

8. EQUITY OWNERSHIP CLAIMED IN TERMS OF PARAGRAPH 2.10 ABOVE. POINTS TO BE CALCULATED FROM INFORMATION FURNISHED IN PARAGRAPH 9.8.

Ownership	Percentage owned	Points claimed
8.1 Equity ownership by persons who had no franchise in the national elections	%
8.2 Equity ownership by women	%
8.3 Equity ownership by disabled persons*	%

*If points are claimed for disabled persons, indicate nature of impairment (see paragraph 2.8 above)

9 DECLARATION WITH REGARD TO EQUITY

9.1 Name of firm :

9.2 VAT registration number :

9.3 Company registration number :

9.4 TYPE OF FIRM

- Partnership
- One person business/sole trader
- Close corporation
- Company
- (Pty) Limited

[TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

9.5 DESCRIBE PRINCIPAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

.....

.....

.....

9.6 COMPANY CLASSIFICATION

- Manufacturer
 - Supplier
 - Professional service provider
 - Other service providers, e.g. transporter, etc.
- [TICK APPLICABLE BOX]

9.7 TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS THE FIRM HAS BEEN IN BUSINESS?

9.8 List all Shareholders by Name, Position, Identity Number, Citizenship, HDI status and ownership, as relevant. Information to be used to calculate the points claimed in paragraph 8.

Name	Date/Position occupied in Enterprise	ID Number	Date RSA Citizenship obtained	* HDI Status			% of business / enterprise owned
				No franchise prior to elections	Women	Disabled	

*Indicate YES or NO

9.9 Consortium / Joint Venture

9.9.1 In the event that preference points are claimed for HDI members by consortia / joint ventures, the following information must be furnished in order to be entitled to the points claimed in respect of the HDI member:

Name of HDI member (to be consistent with paragraph 9.8)	Percentage (%) of the contract value managed or executed by the HDI member

9.10 I/we, the undersigned, who warrants that he/she is duly authorised to do so on behalf of the firm certify that points claimed, based on the equity ownership, indicated in paragraph 8 of the foregoing certificate, qualifies the firm for the preference(s) shown and I / we acknowledge that:

- (i) The information furnished is true and correct.
- (ii) The Equity ownership claimed is in accordance with the General Conditions as indicated in paragraph 1 of this form.
- (iii) In the event of a contract being awarded as a result of points claimed as shown in paragraph 8, the contractor may be required to furnish documentary proof to the satisfaction of the purchaser that the claims are correct.
- (iv) If the claims are found to be incorrect, the purchaser may, in addition to any other remedy it may have -
 - (a) recover costs, losses or damages it has incurred or suffered as a result of that person's conduct;
 - (b) cancel the contract and claim any damages which it has suffered as a result of having to make less favourable arrangements due to such cancellation;
 - (c) impose a financial penalty more severe than the theoretical financial preference associated with the claim which was made in the bid; and

WITNESSES:

1.

.....
SIGNATURE(S) OF BIDDER(S)

2.

DATE:.....

ADDRESS:.....

.....

.....