
NON-PIVOTAL DISCRETIONARY GRANT FUNDING WINDOW FOR TRAINING PROVIDERS TO TRAIN AND CAPACITATE 45 ASPIRANT SKILLS DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROVIDERS (SDPs), CATEGORISED AS HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS (HDI), FOR ACCREDITATION PURPOSES.

1. BACKGROUND TO W&RSETA

The Wholesale and Retail Sector Education and Training Authority (W&RSETA) established as a legal entity on 20 March 2000 in terms of the Skills Development Act no. 97 of 1998. As guided by its mandate, the W&RSETA is required to develop and implement the Sector Skills Plan (SSP) and Strategic Plan (SP) within the framework of the National Skills Development Plan (NSDP), Department of Higher Education & Training (DHET) and National Treasury in promoting and facilitating the skills development in the wholesale and retail sector.

2. INTRODUCTION OF THE PROJECT

This is a transformation project, which aims to develop Skills Development Provider (SDP) who falls under the category of Historically Disadvantaged Individuals (HDI) in three phases as follows:

- Phase 1: Selection of the HDI Skills Development Providers who will be beneficiaries of the programme. This phase was completed in 2021/22 financial year.
- Phase 2: Training of the HDI Skills Development Providers for accreditation purposes. This DG funding window applies to this phase, where the W&RSETA seeks to appoint a Training Provider to train the identified HDI Skills Development Providers.
- Phase 3. Implement a pilot project for the successfully trained and accredited HDI SDPs to train learners. This phase will be implemented in 2023/24 when phase two has been completed.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE DISCRETIONARY GRANT FUNDING WINDOW

3.1 The objective of this Discretionary Grant (DG) funding window is to appoint an Accredited Training Provider(s) who will be contracted to deliver the training and capacitation of forty-five (45) aspiring SDPs / beneficiaries on the interventions.

3.2 The W&RSETA reserves the right to award to one or more accredited Training Providers to deliver on the interventions, as outlined further in this document. This will be dependent on the submissions received outlining the Training Provider's scope of expertise and capacity to deliver on each intervention.

4. SCOPE OF WORK

4.1 Expected outcomes of the funding window

The funding window aims to achieve the following:

- Training of 45 HDI SDPs who have been selected by the W&RSETA on the selected interventions.
- Disbursement of grants and allowances to the respective SDPs. The W&RSETA will provide the grants and allowance funds to the Training Provider as agreed upon in the Service Level Agreement.
- Provision of the tools of trade for the nominated SDPs, that will enable training to be conducted seamlessly. The details of the tools of trade required are provided in the advert.

4.2 Responsibilities and expected deliverables of the Training Provider(s)

The following are the expected responsibilities and deliverables of the contracted Training Provider (s):

- Procure tools of trade for the 45 Beneficiaries. Costs to be detailed in the cost breakdown schedule. (Proforma invoice to be submitted on signing of contract).
- Training must be in a centralised area and beneficiaries must be placed in training rooms in acceptable group sizes.
- Provide a roll-out plan for the training to be conducted. All deliverables will be aligned to the plan. The roll-out plan will be subject to approval prior to training commencement.
- Conduct induction session with W&RSETA representative (s) prior to the implementation of training on of the programme structure.
- Responsible to ensure that learner agreement is in place in the prescribed format and submitting signed learner attendance registers as well as session facilitation reports.
- Administer and disburse all applicable grants and allowances. Proof of payments to be submitted to the W&RSETA.
- Liaise with the respective SETA where the qualification of the intervention being provided resides.
- Record learner achievements and submit to the W&RSETA, together with feedback forms.
- Conduct internal moderation of the Learner Assessments and submit them for external moderation.
- Submit the endorsed External Moderation reports.
- Issue Learner Certificates in conjunction with the relevant SETA.
- Attend progress meetings and submission of report as agreed in the Service Level Agreement / Contract.
- Conduct relevant QCTO administrative paperwork.
- Submit a closure report.

4.3 Responsibilities of the W&RSETA

- Conclude a Service Level Agreement / Contract with the appointed Training Provider(s)
- Provide list of 45 selected beneficiaries to the Contracted Training Provider by the W&RSETA
- Process payment for the procurement of tools of trade in line with the specifications provided.
- Approve the training plan as presented by the Training Provider(s) prior to implementation of the training.
- Verify and induct the beneficiaries prior to training.

- Process payments of funds to allow the Training Provider(s) to disburse Grants, and allowances to the beneficiaries.
- Accreditation Certificates will be awarded to successful SDPs by the W&RSETA.

4.3 Categories of training interventions applicable for the funding window

The funding window applies to various categories of Training Interventions as follows:

Category A: Accredited Training (OD-ETDP)

- Training Provider (1) with scope to conduct targeted training and development using given methodologies, Conduct Outcomes based Assessment, Conduct Outcomes based Moderation

Category B – Accredited Training (Small Business Manager/Owner NQF Level 3)

- Training Provider (2) with scope for Skills programme (Business Small Business Manager/Owner (Operations Level 3)

Category C – Non-Credit Bearing programme (Disability Sensitization and Awareness)

- Training Provider (3) - A Training Provider from the Disability Sector to deliver Disability Sensitization & Awareness training.

Table 4.3.1 Summary of Interventions with Unit Standards ID

Category	Unit Standard ID	Registered Unit Standard	Unit Standard Title
A	115753	ETDPSETA	Conduct outcomes-based Assessments
	117870	ETDPSETA	Conduct targeted training and development using given methodologies
	115759	ETDPSETA	Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments
B	27/SP-134903/Sma3/00263	W&RSETA	Small Business Manager/Owner (Operations) Level 3
C	Non-credit bearing programme		Disability Sensitization & Awareness programme

NB: Applicants for category C should be from the disability sector.

5. PROVISIO FOR LEARNING

- 5.1 The Training Provider will be expected to observe COVID 19 and all other OHS regulatory protocols during training and ensure that relevant PPE is provided to learners and training facilitators, informed by the National Disaster Management Regulations that will be in place at the time of training.
- 5.2 Assistive devices must also be provided to learners with disabilities, and this will be done in line with the W&RSETA's Policy for Management of Skills Development Projects for People with Disabilities and applicable forms which are available on www.wrseta.org.za.

7. DURATION OF WORK

- 7.1 The duration of work will be for a period of 12 months from the date of appointment/ contracting. The contract period will include preparation and facilitation of training until certification.

8. MONITORING PROGRESS AND QUALITY OF SERVICES

- 8.1 The W&RSETA shall monitor the progress and quality of the service delivery as outlined in the schedules contained in the SLA and Implementation/ Roll -out Plan

9. INDEPENDENCE AND OBJECTIVITY OF STAFF

- 9.1. As per the SLA that will be signed between the SETA and the successful provider, the contracted Training Provider and their staff must act ethically and maintain high moral standards as reflected in their policies.

10. PRICING

- 10.1 All pricing provided for the tools of trade must be inclusive of any applicable VAT.

EVALUATION


Technical Evaluation: Training Provider- HDI Skills Development Providers				
Evaluation Criteria			Weighting	
1. Team Composition			20 points	
2. Training Experience and Expertise			40 points	
3. Approach and Methodology			40 points	
Total			100 points	
Compulsory Submission Requirements:				
			Yes	No
• Company Registration CIPC				
• Proof of Tax Compliance				
• BEEE Certificate				
• 2 Hard copies (each category must have its own submission)				
• Proof of Accreditation (for interventions that requires accreditation)				
• Applicants who are applying for category C must provide proof of ownership and registration as a Training Provider in the Disability sector				
		Evaluation Criteria : CATEGORIES A & B	Weighting	
Team Composition		<p>The Training Provider should demonstrate that the team possesses the required and appropriate qualifications, and experience (skills and competencies) to conduct the training to implement the project successfully. There must be evidence-based proof of similar programmes implemented and completed.</p> <p>1. Provide a list of team members with:</p> <p>1.1. Position and experience of each team member must be indicated in relation to the scope of services.</p> <p>1.2. Qualification/s of each team member: This must be supported by certified qualifications, of which certification should not be older than 3 months. Uncertified qualifications and/or certified qualifications older than 3 months at the time of the closing date will not be accepted and will therefore not score any points.</p> <p>Evaluation points:</p>	<u>20 points</u>	
Value	Weighting			
0	0 points			
1	5 points			
2	10 Points			
3	20 points			

	<p>0= 0 points Poor: No evidence submitted. Team does not have suitable skills, qualifications, or experience and/or team composition is not appropriate</p> <p>1= 5 points Fair: Team composition comprised of partially skilled, qualified and/or experienced team members</p> <p>2=10 Skilled: Team composition is appropriately skilled, has appropriate qualifications and with limited experience and evidence-based proof of similar programmes implemented and completed.</p> <p>3= 20 points Skilled: Team composition is appropriately skilled, has appropriate qualifications and experience. The experience is articulated, and documentary proof is submitted with the application.</p>											
<p>Training Experience and Expertise</p> <table><tr><th>Value</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0 points</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>5 points</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>10 Points</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>20 points</td></tr></table>	Value	Weighting	0	0 points	1	5 points	2	10 Points	3	20 points	<p>Training Experience and Expertise The submitting Training Provider must provide proof of experience of having performed this type of work before, evidenced by the following documentary proof.</p> <p>Reference letters: Three (3) Reference letters from different organisations as evidence of related work previously conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The Reference letter(s) must not be older than 3 years, indicating the service (s) rendered. That is, work conducted must have been conducted in the past 3 years or less:- The Reference letter must be on the letterhead of the previously serviced client, reflecting the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Type of work conducted, year and duration* Referee name, title and contact detail* Signed by the Referee <p>0 = 0 points - No evidence submitted 1= 5 points - Training Provider submitted one qualifying reference letter 2= 10 points - Training Provider submitted two qualifying reference letters 3= 20 points - Training Provider submitted three qualifying reference letters, indicating evidence of training provided that is of the same Unit Standards with the intervention (s) being applied for.</p> <p>Evidence of similar/related Training delivered in the context of skills development</p>	<p>40 points</p> <p>20 Points</p> <p>20 Points</p>
Value	Weighting											
0	0 points											
1	5 points											
2	10 Points											
3	20 points											


<table><tr><th>Value</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0 points</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>5 points</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>10 Points</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>20 points</td></tr></table>	Value	Weighting	0	0 points	1	5 points	2	10 Points	3	20 points	<p>0= 0 points Unrelated / Irrelevant Training / non-accredited /completion rate less than 60% / the evidence is older than 3 years</p> <p>1= 5 points One (1) evidence of related Training work has been provided, work conducted not older than 3 years with completion rate of not less than 70%.</p> <p>2= 10 points Two (2) evidence of related Training work has been provided completion rate more than 85% evidence is not of work that is older than 3 years.</p> <p>3 = 20 points Three (3) evidence of related Training work, with completion rate of 90-100%. Work included in the evidence is not older than 3 years.</p> <p><i>NB: The 3 years period required for work / evidence to be provided does not apply to Category C. No timeframe limits are required for this category.</i></p>	
Value	Weighting											
0	0 points											
1	5 points											
2	10 Points											
3	20 points											
<p>Approach and Methodology</p> <table><tr><th>Value</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0 points</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>5 points</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>10 Points</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>20 points</td></tr></table>	Value	Weighting	0	0 points	1	5 points	2	10 Points	3	20 points	<p>3. Methodology alignment to specifications.</p> <p>The Training Provider should describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The training approach and methodology to be used, including marking of POEs and uploading of Assessmentsb) Provide examples of tools, instruments including POE and Assessments formatsc) Include timelines for specific processes like remediation where requiredd) Indicate how they would deal with Risk (delays, and non-submissions from beneficiaries) <p>0 = 0 points Poor: The suggested method of delivery of the services gives rise to concerns The approach does not demonstrate that the proposer has the expertise to deliver all or a substantial part of the services. There is a significant risk of poor performance should the proposer be successful</p> <p>1 = 5 points Fair: Whilst the suggested method of delivery of each element of the service is generally</p>	<p><u>40 points</u></p> <p>20 Points</p>
Value	Weighting											
0	0 points											
1	5 points											
2	10 Points											
3	20 points											

<table><tr><th>Value</th><th>Weighting</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0 points</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>5 points</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>10 Points</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>20 points</td></tr></table>	Value	Weighting	0	0 points	1	5 points	2	10 Points	3	20 points	<p>acceptable, the proposal lacks detail and/or certain elements of the methodology. There is some risk of poor performance, the successful Proposer will / would need to be managed closely.</p> <p>2 = 10 points</p> <p>Good: The proposed way of providing each component of the services is acceptable, and the proposal shows that they have the necessary expertise and knowledge to provide the services. However, some parts of the methodology are ambiguous and might not completely meet the scope of the services. There is some risk not being met entirely, this risk will need to be managed.</p> <p>3 = 20 points</p> <p>Excellent: The proposal provides extremely strong proof that they have the necessary expertise and knowledge to deliver each component of the scope of services, and the suggested method of service delivery is exceptional. There is a low risk of poor performance should the Proposer be successful.</p> <p>Approach alignment to specifications:</p> <p>0 = 0 points - Poor / No alignment</p> <p>1 = 5 points - Average (At least 40% of the elements in the training methodology are explained in detail)</p> <p>2 = 10 points - Good (60% of elements in the training methodology well detailed, and are explained in practical ways, not just theoretic copy and paste from different sources)</p> <p>3 = 20 points - Excellent (More than all training aspects explained in detail, inclusive of the techniques to be used to collect, process and conduct assessments, and mitigating risks)</p>	20 Points
	Value	Weighting										
	0	0 points										
	1	5 points										
	2	10 Points										
	3	20 points										

11. APPROVALS

Requested By			
Name	Pearl Makhudu		
Position	Specialist – Disability Development		
Signature		Date	26 Aug 2022

Recommendations			
Recommended:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Recommended:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manager's Full Name	Edzisani Ellen Netshiozwi		
Position	Senior Manager: Strategic Planning		
Notes			
Manager's Signature		Date	26 August 2022

Approvals			
Approved:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Approved:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manager's Full Name			
Position (Executive)			
Notes			
Manager's Signature		Date	26 August 2022