

Project:	DBSA Port of Durban Point Container Terminal		
Job Number:	TBC	Date:	2024/01/18 10:19
Clarification Register			
Clarification to be submitted to:		lihleSCM@dbsa.org	

Date Raised	Reference Number	Clarification	Raised By	Response	Date Closed
14/11/2023	1	The importance of this project requires that bidders are able to provide their very best team and price. The time allowed to reply to this RFP is short considering the size and scope of the works to be considered. Please consider an extension of time to the end of January 2024. This is required to also take into account the festive season and the builders break from the 15th December 2023 to the 8th January 2024.		The RFP closing date have been moved to 25 January 2024	27-Nov-23
14/11/2023	2	The current entrance channel to the Port of Durban between the north and south breakwaters is dredged to 17m CD. Please confirm that the detailed design and dredging scope of works will include the dredging of the entrance channel and basin adjacent to the point container terminal to 18.5m CD.		Entrance channel and basin adjacent to the point container terminal is not part of the point container terminal scope.	29-Nov-23
14/11/2023	3	Please confirm what the length of rail for the terminal is. Annexure M states on page 3 that this is to be 60m.		Rail terminal is for 50 wagon train and two locomotives length	29-Nov-23
14/11/2023	4	Annexure A (Financial Proposal) has not been provided with the tender pack. This is required to comply with 1.4 The Financial Proposal on Page 29 of the RFP where Bidders are required to state their price uniformly, refer to Annexure A (Financial Proposal) to enable comparison with other bids.		It is loaded on our website.	29-Nov-23
14/11/2023	5	In Annexure M: a number of items are specified with the requirement for specified budget amounts to be included. The Scope of Works document states that "Bidders may add, to this estimate, their cost of time for supervision, contract management and preparation of the geotechnical report." Please confirm that the allocated value is for the contractor only and does not include any of the bidders cost for time, etc and that this item must be costed by the bidder to include (in addition to the budget sum) the cost for the bidder to undertake the supervision, contract management and preparation of the required reports. This is valid for Items: 1.1.2 Geotechnical investigation 1.1.3 Surveys 1.1.4 Engineering model and operating philosophy 1.1.5 Traffic studies and/or traffic modeling, as well as the Road & Rail Plan		The cost of time for supervision and contract management for special studies is not included on the budget sum. The Bidders may add, to this estimate, their cost of time for supervision, contract management and preparation of the report.	29-Nov-23
14/11/2023	6	In Annexure M: a number of items are specified with the requirement for specified budget amounts to be included. Where the bidder has the capability to undertake these works, Will the bidder (if successful) be permitted to undertake part or all of the scope of the works listed in each of the 4 budget items? That is, for example, if we are able to undertake traffic modelling, we can undertake this scope as the winning bidder within or below the budget allowable and these items where the bidder is able to undertake the work will not be put out to tender. This is valid for Items: 1.1.2 Geotechnical investigation 1.1.3 Surveys 1.1.4 Engineering model and operating philosophy 1.1.5 Traffic studies and/or traffic modeling, as well as the Road & Rail Plan		Yes, the successful bidder can undertake the specialist study inhouse, however the provisional sum cannot be changed.	29-Nov-23
14/11/2023	7	Has the Port Terminal Operator been selected? If so, who are they expected to be?		No, Port Terminal Operator has not been selected	29-Nov-23

20/11/2023	8	A requirement for a Traffic study as part of a Physical Monitoring study is noted in Task 4: Determination of impacts of the Project and its activities, and Task Order 1.1. Quantify the requirements of the study and confirm the extent of road/rail network envisaged to be upgraded outside the Port.		Traffic study is required that the appointed Service Provider must undertake a Traffic Study, which will be used to develop the Road and Rail Plan, to ensure there is sufficient provision for the efficient movement of goods within the Point area, from point container terminal to M4 and M7. The rail network from Point to Maydon Wharf.	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	9	Confirm if a full Traffic Impact Assessment is required that will be subject to statutory approval - must it be approved by the local authorities (Ethekewini)? Or is the purpose of the traffic study only to inform the preliminary design?		Yes, full Traffic Impact Assessment is required to be approved by the local authorities (Ethekewini)	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	10	Has the planned terminal and its impact on the road network been discussed with, and/or approved by Ethekewini and any other affected authorities such as SANRAL and KZN Department of Transport?		The project has been discussed, but Traffic solution has not been developed and approved. This study requires a full Traffic Impact Assessment to be developed and approved by the local authorities (Ethekewini)	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	11	Has provision been made for off-site truck staging area/s to support the terminal? If yes provide all details of the facility/ies, if No how will truck staging be managed - or should the traffic study identify a staging area/s?		Yes, this study must identify staging area/s to support the terminal.	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	12	The TOR states the use of rail must be maximised for container movements to/from the terminal. What is the minimum % /no. of TEUs that must be transported via rail?		The study will evaluate various road/rail splits and recommend the maximum and minimum splits	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	13	Based on the presentation this morning during the compulsory tender briefing, does a company have to apply for both the design and ESIA components of the project or can they only tender for one component i.e. just the ESIA?		Yes, the company has to apply for both the design and ESIA components	29-Nov-23
20/11/2023	14	We register our intent to respond to this RFP. With consideration to the scope of work and, in the interest of preparing a fully responsive bid, we respectfully request that the DBSA give consideration to extending the closing date to the end of January 2024.		The RFP closing date have been moved to 25 January 2024	29-Nov-23
2023/11/21	15	Kindly find below clarification questions related to the RFP for “Detailed design, ESIA and commissioning of the point container terminal at the port of Durban”. 1.Your requirement for all 12 key staff in the EPCM team to have implemented at least two operational container seaport terminals is extremely onerous. In Southern Africa very few new container terminals were constructed in the past 20 years. This requirement will therefore limit the participation by most of the consultants in the region. The technical nature of the work does not necessarily demand this level of experience by the full team. We request you to reconsider the evaluation criteria. 2.We hereby request an extension of time for submission of bids, preferably to mid-February 2024. 3.Please clarify/confirm the elements of the terminal to be included in the detailed design stage, i.e. Task Order 2. Is the focus primarily on the marine elements, i.e. quay wall, quay furniture, dredging and reclamation but the design of the pavement, container stacking, road and rail, civil infrastructure, buildings, etc excluded? 4.Please provide the standard/ particular (specific conditions of contract) provisions of contract that will be applicable to this project.		1. For this strategic project we require this experience, therefore this criteria will remain. 2. The RFP closing date have been moved to 25 January 2024. 3. Task Order 2 focuses on the marine elements - quay wall, quay furniture, dredging and reclamation including bulk services. other elements (pavement, container stacking, road and rail, civil infrastructure, buildings, etc excluded) are for the terminal operator. 4. NEC option G	29-Nov-23

23/11/2023	16	<p>Evaluation Criteria. There are a number of roles where CVs for staff with past port and especially Container Terminal experience are required to achieve maximum points. Some of these roles are best served with local South African skills and experience which would be relevant to our laws, regulations and especially to the specific requirements of Transnet and TNPA. There are not expected to be many people available in the market who can demonstrate the requirements as set out in the Evaluation criteria. We request that for the following roles, the requirements are revised to ensure a more local and achievable demonstration of relevant experience, especially related to works with Transnet and or TNPA.</p> <p>Project Manager Construction Manager Quantity Surveyor Project Control Manager Safety Agent Quality Officer Contracts Administrator</p>		For this strategic project we require this experience, therefore this criteria will remain.	29-Nov-23
23/11/2023	17	<p>Please can you clarify the following:</p> <p>Annexure L of the tender document is the ToR for the ESIA.</p> <p>1. Please can you confirm if the costing associated with the ESIA must also include specialist studies that may be required. 2. There is a list of specialist studies on the last page of Annexure L (Page 20), must these studies be undertaken as part of the ESIA or are these just guidelines?</p>		Yes, all the specialist studies must be undertaken, including the costing.	29-Nov-23
2023/11/29	18	<p>1The Bidder and Company Experience is too onerous as it applies to the project and should be reduced as it is unlikely that the project will have a CAPEX amount to the value of 400m USD.</p> <p>2The criteria for 2 refer to container terminals and the last item refers to break bulk terminals which is not the project in question as these are fundamentally different assets which are no longer built specifically for MPT for example which are typically repurposed so scoring 7 does not mean that the supplier can do a container terminal EPCM project and is hence irrelevant as a criteria.</p> <p>3EPCM and feasibility are not the same study. A feasibility study for such a terminal is done to make an investment decision not always yielding an asset which may not lead to an operational terminal and hence should be excluded.</p> <p>4Terminals in SA are typically done in two parts i.e the infrastructure and the fit-out (mechanical, electrical and industrial incl equipment) are often done by separate suppliers – the value refers to both and how does one define the actual assets in question contained in the R400m USD if this is still to hold. This suggests that international projects may count more than local Transnet does not execute in this manner and no firm will have any claim to such scale.</p> <p>5There is only one terminal that may be applicable which is the Port of Ngqura and perhaps the Cape Town Container terminal which may favour a single supplier. As such we reserve the right to challenge the process, the supplier and the rationale for the construction of this opportunity.</p> <p>6Note that there are suppliers in the local market, such as Zutari, that can do this work and Transnet project managers will be aware these criteria are prejudicial. This type of criteria has not been used in the past for container terminal developments so we would want to know why now for a smaller terminal.</p>		<p>1. For this strategic project we require this experience, therefore this criteria will remain and CAPEX amount apply to any project in the built environment.</p> <p>2. In order not to make it too onerous, opportunity has been provided to score points on other marine structures and terminals.</p> <p>3. The RFP is structured in task orders and provide project continuity and reduction in procurement events.</p> <p>4. The 400m USD is for the entire project all inclusive.</p> <p>5. The experience is not limited to South African projects.</p> <p>6. This allows opportunities for partnerships with experienced companies, the criteria was also influenced by the funders.</p>	08-Dec-23

2023/11/29	19	<p>1. Please provide the particular conditions for the NEC3 Consultancy Agreement to understand</p> <p>a. Indemnity, Insurance and Liability – The Employers level of cover requirements in relation to professional indemnity insurance, public liability, Compensation for occupational Injuries and Diseases and what umbrella insurance is being provided by the Employer.</p> <p>b.What Option is this Contract e.g. Option E Time based contract?</p> <p>c.Other requirements from the Employer.</p> <p>2. This is a major international bid and requires significant amount of preparation and internal reviews and approvals. We are requesting an extension of time to end of January 2024. This will assist in developing the bid further and getting approvals after the Construction Industry closure from 14 December 2023 to 12 January 2024.</p>		<p>1. a. Transnet will cover the general indemnity insurance. The consultant is responsible for the indemnity insurance for the design.</p> <p>b. NEC Option G</p> <p>c. None</p> <p>2. The RFP closing date have been moved to 25 January 2024.</p>	08-Dec-23
2023/11/30	20	<p>Appendix A: Gate review overview.</p> <p>Please confirm if the TNPA PLP FEL system will be used for the Gate Review or if the new system will be used. Appendix A appears to be specific to the previous TNPA PLP FEL system which is understood to no longer be in use.</p>		<p>Yes, The gate review PLP process still exist. Its the phasing that has changed (concept, Prefeasibility, Feasibility, bankable business case and execution). One gate review will be conducted at the end Feasibility (task order 2)</p>	17-Jan-24
2023/11/30	21	<p>Are the marine conditions for the design to be provided by TNPA from the Pre-feasibility design or will the consultant be required to undertake numerical modelling of the wave climate as well?</p>		<p>No, TNPA will not provide Pre-feasibility design. The consultant will be required to undertake numerical modelling of the wave climate.</p>	17-Jan-24
2023/11/30	22	<p>Are the berthing and mooring forces determined by TNPA from the Pre-feasibility design or will the consultant be required to udnertake the calculation of berthing and mooring forced by general calculation or by Specific Dynamic Mooring Assessment?</p>		<p>No, TNPA will not provide Pre-feasibility design. The consultant will be required to undertake the calculation of berthing and mooring forced by general calculation or by Specific Dynamic Mooring Assessment</p>	17-Jan-24
2023/11/30	23	<p>Annexure A (Price Proposal) TASK Order 2. The listed cost items in Annexure A do not align to the listed tasks in Annexure M. Please update Annexure A to align to the scope of works or please provide an update to Annexure M to align the scope of works to the pricing schedule.</p>		<p>In our review, the Annexure A Task Order 2 aligns with the listed items in Annexure M. Bidders may highlight their pricing assumption where they're of the opinion that there is misalignment.</p>	17-Jan-24
2023/11/30	24	<p>Annexure A (Price Proposal). Fees for the delivery of Task Orders 4 and 5 for support during construction and commissioning is not reasonable at this time. The construction duration could vary based on a number of variables. It is best practice to use the provided rates to determine the price for this scope based on your own set hours for each key specialist.</p>		<p>The consultant must price tasks based on the activities and deliverables required and take in to account all risk associated with deliverables. Task Orders 4 and 5 fall under construction monitoring level 3 of ECSA.</p>	17-Jan-24
2023/11/30	25	<p>Will an extension in time be given for clarifications?</p>		<p>The bid closing date is the 25 January 2024</p>	17-Jan-24