



Terms of Reference

Appointment of a service provider to provide a Job Evaluation, Grading & Salary Benchmarking for Agrément South Africa

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RFQ Number | ASA 03/12/2021 |
| Date of issue | 12/01/2022 |
| Bid Closing date | 25/01/2022 at 12:00 pm |
| Submissions | Dmamaregane@agrement.co.za |

1. TECHNICAL ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:

Nozipho Mabasa

+27 12 841 2859

NMabasa@agrement.co.za

2. SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT ENQUIRIES MAY BE DIRECTED TO:

Daniel Mamaregane

+27 12 841 2735

Dmamaregane@agrement.co.za

1. Introduction

Agrément South Africa extends a call for the submission of proposals from suitably qualified service providers to provide job evaluation, Grading and Salary Benchmarking for 52 positions of Agrément South Africa.

2. Background

Agrément South Africa was established in 1969 and has been operating within the CSIR under the auspices of its Built Environment Unit. In December 2015, Agrément South Africa was recognised an independent agency to bring an impartial judgement to the evaluation of innovative construction products and systems in the interest of the consumer and the construction industry at large.

The Agrément South Africa Act was accented to by the Honourable President of the Republic of South Africa as Act No 11 of 2015 from 1 April 2017. Agrément South Africa being established as a Schedule 3A entity from 1 April 2017, were previously it was transferred to CSIR being a Schedule 3B entity with a staff compliment of 36 employees and 52 approved position's in the organizational structure. The entity operates under a delegation of authority from the Minister of Public Works.

ASA seeks to engage the services of a reputable and technically qualified organization to undertake the job evaluation, grading and pay scale review process. ASA therefore hereby solicits proposals from interested individuals or firms to undertake the assignment.

The main objectives are:

- To develop a logical and consistent Job Evaluation framework upon which ASA can base future job grading decisions; The framework will be comprehensive, including competencies and other relevant criteria.
- Ensure fairness and equality, in terms of job grading, between staff members currently employed, and in comparison, with newly recruited staff members.
- Undertake an alignment exercise, adjusting the job levels of current staff to address inequalities and disparities between roles in the same job family and across the organization and fully recognizing roles and responsibilities undertaken.

3. Purpose

A rational basis for making justifiable decisions on job grades and consistent approach for the determination and management of relativities between jobs.

The basis for developing an equitable pay structure across ASA based on a logical method of measuring relative job scope and size.

4. Scope of services

Activity 1: Job Evaluation

- Analyze all relevant job descriptions, compare, and align to the approved organizational structure.
- Conduct consultation session/interviews with line managers and subordinates to gather information to compile a job description in the event of newly created jobs
- Review job descriptions in the case of existing jobs.
- Evaluate and grade jobs based on the job descriptions provided by ASA (A total of +/- 52 jobs) to be evaluated and graded.
- Job grading according to different 3 grading systems for the organization to select one.
- Conduct salary benchmarking on all jobs against credible market data in line with the grading system.
- Provide ASA with a detailed report that sets out the methodology that was followed, the recommended grade and motivation for the recommendation for all jobs graded.
- Develop job families' categories for all jobs within ASA.

Activity 2: Review ASA Pay Scales

- Review current pay scales i.e. establish the distribution of the current remuneration within ASA
- Design pay scales based on the statistical analysis of current pay, using the grading system methodology that would have been approved in activity 1.
- Cost the implications of adopting a single pay scale and conduct a comparison of everyone to the proposed scale.
- Develop an approach/methodology for the management of outliers.

- Executive's pay scales must be done separately from all other employees when reviewing ASA's Pay Scales.
- Provide ASA with a detailed report that sets out the methodology that was followed in the revision of the pay scales based on the above point.
- Conduct an annual salary benchmark process to compare ASA's pay scales.
- Gather benchmark data from different salary survey houses for comparison purposes.
- The benchmarking process should include all elements of the total package, as ASA is using a Cost to Company remuneration structure.

Activity 3 – Job Evaluation and Grading System for ASA

- Once the service provider has evaluated and graded the jobs in Activity 1.
- The service provider as part of their hand over activities, is required to provide access to an online job evaluation and grading system to ASA that will enable ASA to conduct its internal job evaluation and grading process, to which the service provider will validate the outcome of the internal job evaluation and grading process.
- The system should enable ASA to evaluate and grade ASA's jobs in line with its internal Job Evaluation Policy and procedures as well as the approved company sizing.
- The systems should enable validation of graded jobs.
- It should allow for customization to ASAs terminology, where applicable.
- It should have clearly defined factors in line with the market but not limited to qualifications, experience and skills, training requirements, problem solving, communication and influence and the financial impact the role has in contributing to the company's bottom line as well as applicable points to each factor.
- It should be easily accessible and web-based (i.e., on-line platform).
- Provide market benchmark data as part of job evaluation and grading.
- Have proven and scientific capability for job evaluation and grading of all jobs within the organization.
- The system must be hosted on the service provider's infrastructure, to which ASA will be granted access to the service provider's system to capture the input for validation by the service provider.
- The service provider should provide support to ASA in the event of system challenges, technical glitches and/or performance of the system for a period of three (3) years (e.g., user licenses, etc.).

- Provision should be made by the service provider to grant ASA a total of two (2) licenses for two (2) users to access the system for a period of three (3) years.
- The service provider should provide support to ASA in terms of grading and/or evaluation outcome that requires validation for a period of three (3) years.
- The service provider should provide training for the Job Evaluation Committee and the Human Resource Department in terms of using the job evaluation and grading system as well as provide additional training on drafting job descriptions and the grading process for a period of three (3) years; and
- The service provider should also develop a job description writing manual.

5. Technical Specifications

5.1 Implementation

Sessions will be implemented at Agrément South Africa Offices to introduce the services to the employees of Agrément South Africa. The implementation session will be a complete marketing role by creating awareness about the process.

5.2 Information

Timeous request for relevant information, including contact details, employee details and their immediate dependants.

5.3 Co-ordination

Annual set up for information sessions in consultation with Agrément South Africa, Human Resources Department.

5.4 Training

A designated trainer will be provided for training sessions

6. Period of Assignment

The service provider will be appointed for a period of three (3) years.

However, it should be noted that certain activities, as defined in the scope of work, will be required to be implemented within the first two (2) months of the project, while other activities need to be done on an annual basis for every financial year within the three (3) year period.

7. Mandatory Requirements

The following are the mandatory requirements:

- Is the service provider capable of conducting Job Analysis, Job Evaluation and Job Grading?
- Is the service provider capable of developing Job Families and classifying jobs as critical and/or scarce positions?
- Is the service provider capable of reviewing pay scales and developing new pay scales?
- Is the service provider capable of benchmarking salaries against the construction related industry?
- Is the service provider able to grant ASA access to the service provider's online job evaluation and grading system, to which ASA captures input for the service provider to validate?

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

8.1 Evaluate the impact of the service

Agreement South Africa will determine the evaluation criteria, agreed criteria will determine the level and technique of measuring the impact of the service.

8.2 Complaints handling mechanism

The appointed provider must implement and exercise the necessary measures to address complaints with corrective measures and provide to ASA.

8.3 Time frames

Set up agreed turnaround times for findings and complaints

9. Confidentiality

All information collected shall be treated with the highest level of confidentiality, this applies to the information acquired before, during and after completion of the contracted period, in compliance with Act No. 4 of 2013, *Protection of Personal Information Act*.

10. Mandatory Procurement Documents to be submitted together with the proposal

- CSD report
- SBD 4, 6.1, 8 and 9

- Certified copy of BBEE certificate/Affidavit (points will not given to companies that does not submit)
- General Conditions of Contract
- Quote/Pricing schedules

11. Qualifying Criteria: Technical and Functionality

The following values will be applicable when evaluating the bid

5=Very good 3= Good 1= Satisfactory 0= Poor

| NO | Functionality Criteria | Description of functionality criteria | Maximum number of tender evaluation process |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Methodology | Please provide an execution plan | 40 |
| 2 | Experience: | Relevant experience of technical expert in the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading. | 20 |
| 3 | Experience; Specifications and Criteria | Relevant experience of technical expert in the implementation and the coordination of specifications. | 30 |
| 4 | Technical Support | Relevant experience in providing technical support and maintenance of the grading tool. | 10 |
| Total evaluation points for quality | | | 100 |
| Minimum Score | | | 60 |

Table A: The scoring of the technical approach will be as follows:

| Score | Technical approach and methodology |
|---|--|
| Poor (score 0 Points) | The technical approach and / or methodology is poor / is unlikely to satisfy project objectives or requirements. The technical expert has misunderstood certain aspects of the scope of work and does not deal with the critical aspects of the project. |
| Satisfactory (score 1 Point) | The approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology. The approach does not adequately deal with the critical characteristics of the project. The quality plan, way risk is to be managed etc. is too generic. |
| Good (score 3 Points) | The approach is specifically tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology and is sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes that may occur during execution. The quality plan and approach to managing risk etc. is specifically tailored to the critical characteristics of the project. |
| Very good (score 5 Points) | Besides meeting the “good” rating, the important issues are approached in an innovative and efficient way, indicating that the tenderer has outstanding knowledge of state-of-the-art approaches. The approach paper details ways to improve the project outcomes and the quality of the outputs. |

Table B: The scoring of relevant experience in the of technical expert in the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|--|--|
| Poor (score 0 Points) | No previous experience and understanding of the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading. |
| Satisfactory (score 1 Point) | Inadequate experience and understanding of the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading. |
| Good (score 3 Points) | Adequate relevant previous experience and understanding of the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading |

| | |
|--|---|
| Very good (score 5 Points) | In-depth relevant previous experience and understanding of the job evaluation, benchmarking and salary grading. |
|--|---|

Table C: The scoring of relevant experience in the organisation in the development of specifications will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|--|---|
| Poor (score 0 Points) | No previous experience. |
| Satisfactory (score 1 Point) | Inadequate experience and understanding of the Specification. |
| Good (score 3 Points) | Adequate relevant previous experience and understanding of the Specification. |
| Very good (score 5 Points) | In-depth relevant previous experience and understanding of the Specification. |

Table D: The scoring of relevant experience and capacity of the organization in providing technical support will be as follows:

| Score | Experience and understanding |
|--|---|
| Poor (score 0 Points) | Successful provision of technical support services to one or less technical projects over the past 5 years. |
| Good (score 3 Points) | Successful provision of technical support services to between 2 and 4 technical projects over the past 5 years. |
| Very Good (score 5 Points) | Successful provision of technical support services to 5 or more technical projects over the past 5 years. |

ANNEXURE B

PRICING SCHEDULE

The cost breakdown of the work components must be submitted with the RFP.

| Work Component | Deliverable | Cost (excluding VAT) |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Activity 1 | Job evaluation | R____. |
| Activity 2 | Review ASA Pay Scales | R____. |
| Activity 3 | – Job Evaluation and Grading System for ASA | |
| Activity 4 | Attendance of Technical Committee Meetings and development and presenting summary presentations of the technical reports. | R____. |
| Provision | | 15% |
| Sub-total (excluding VAT) | | R____. |
| Sub-total (including VAT) | | |
| Total | | |

NB: Failure to submit the above-mentioned attachments may result in your proposal being disqualified.