

DATE: 06 JUNE 2025  
EMAIL: [nomascm@dbsa.org](mailto:nomascm@dbsa.org)

ENQUIRIES: NOMA RAKOMA  
TEL: 011 313 3263

### ADDENDUM NO 3

#### RFP020/2025

APPOINTMENT OF A PSP TO DRIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF CSP2 MINIBUS TAXI (MBT) REFORM RESEARCH THAT ENHANCE THE EFFICIENCY, SUSTAINABILITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE MBT INDUSTRY AT NATIONAL AND CITY LEVEL FOR NATIONAL TREASURY CITIES SUPPORT PROGRAMME (CSP)

Dear Bidder.

#### 1. BIDDER QUERIES

Included with this addendum are the queries received and the responses. We trust that this information will aid you in preparing a comprehensive response.

- a. **Question:** Can bidders highlight their collective experience, as part of the bidders' experience in the evaluation towards meeting the criteria.

*Response: The bidding entity can submit a total number of their collective experience, drawing from a number of projects or individual experiences.*

- b. **Question:** From the scope of works, one of the items is to provide a review of the Transforming transit in South Africa project which is related work. Could that document or the final design document be shared with others for review, as we would likely have to look at what if it's going to be used for the review of that.

*Response: No, only the successful service provider will be provided access. And they can then provide the review.*

- c. **Question:** The revised Pricing Schedule (Annexure A) indicates that the Appointed Service Provider would be required to "Support city and Transport Authority (TA) with the launch of pilot project". What types of support activities are envisaged here?

*Response: The bidder must outline the proposed activities as part of their methodology and approach, drawing on their experience in delivering similar projects*

- d. **Question:** We assume that the costs put forward in the pricing schedule do not include any costs associated with systems development and hardware required for the pilot (such as the system development and technologies for cashless payment, vehicle tracking and monitoring, etc). Is this correct?

*Response: Yes, this is correct.*

- e. **Question:** The RFP indicates that the Transforming Transit in South Africa (TTSA) final report is a critical document to be reviewed and considered by bidders. Given that the consultants involved in preparing the TTSA report are likely to participate in this tender, we respectfully request that the TTSA final report be made available to all bidders to ensure a fair and equitable bidding process, particularly as one of the core

tasks requires a review of this document. Additionally, bidders should be afforded ample opportunity to consider this final report, and this may have impact on the current RFP deadline.

**Response:** *The TTSA documentation will be made available to the successful service provider upon appointment. Access to the project documentation is not necessary in order to price for this tender.*

- f. **Question:** The RFP refers to a “Bidding entity”. For purposes of **Company track record**, would it be sufficient for the Bidder with its key experts (internal team and also their subconsultants) to highlight its collective experience to meet your functional criteria in regard to company track record? Could the Client confirm that the Bidding Entity itself does not itself have had the experience but rather the Bidding Entity (with its own staff, and key experts as subconsultants) would be sufficient and qualify for those points? Or would the Bidding Entity have to be structured as a consortium/partnership in order to be awarded those relevant points?

**Response:** *The bidding entity can submit a total number of their collective experience, drawing from a number of projects or individual experiences. The points will be scored based on the collective experience.*

- g. **Question:** If a Bidding entity route for bid submission is selected by bidders, with one main company as lead and relevant sub consultants being part of that entity (with a letter of intent from each sub consultant) would a consolidated BBBEE certificate be needed or not? There is just one lead company in this arrangement. Please advise.

**Response:** *If the decision is to tender as a Consortium/Join Venture or Partnership a consolidated BBBEE is required. However, if it is one entity decides to sub-contract, the BBBEE of the bidding company would be required. (Please ensure you submit subcontracting agreements)*

- h. **Question:** Project Leader requirements note the requirement for proficiency in an SA indigenous language. Noting that the RFP intends for this to be considered and explored country-wide (hence various languages) would it be sufficient for a bidding entity to demonstrate a PL with the project relevant experience and be supported by a bespoke stakeholder engagement specialist/s suited to each city (a support team to the PL)?

**Response:** *The pilot project will be launched in the City of Joburg only. The bidder can provide support services as deemed necessary to undertake the task and deliver the output. These support services must be included in the price for the output.*

- i. **Question:** The outputs listed in the RFP don't currently align with the scope of works in the RFP, please can the outputs required by the Client be clarified. Will the Client be issuing an amended Scope of Works in order to address this issue?

**Response:** *The outputs have been generated based on the items indicated in the scope of works. There is no need to amend the scope of works. The bidder should just concentrate on the outputs and activities table and price for these deliverables, based on the tasks indicated in the scope of works.*

- j. **Question:** The functional criteria require listing all relevant projects and the role played by the key personnel listed; can projects under this category also be as those managed whilst in a government organisation i.e. where a Key Personnel was a senior government official and managed a number of various projects/teams e.g. Projects run and led by the City of Johannesburg/Cape Town etc?

**Response:** *Yes, these projects can be listed as experience on condition that the individual was a senior official and the project manager for the relevant projects.*

- k. **Question:** The RFP indicates significant engagement time with the MBT Industry and its leadership. Previous experience indicates that MBT Leadership will require monetary compensation to participate in meetings/sessions (based on projects like this). Will this cost be covered by CSP, CoJ, etc. or is this expected to be costed for by bidders in their bids?

***Response:** The engagements will mostly be at a leadership and executive management level. Previous experience has been that there is no compensation requested at this level of engagement.*

- l. **Question:** With reference to Annexure A - Pricing schedule (pg 50 of the re-issued RFP document): Is it expected that the first half of the table that sums the costs for **SUB-TOTAL ACTIVITIES (professional fees)** be the same value that is expected in the second adjoined table for the Project Team Professionals for the **SUB-TOTAL (Project Team Fees) Excl. VAT**?

***Response:** Pricing schedule has been updated and the second part has been removed.*

- m. **Question:** What is meant by “**Fee Rate**” in the second adjoined table for the Project Team Professionals? Is this meant to refer to the indication of an hourly rate for the individual project team member?

***Response:** This has been removed as per addendum 2.*

- n. **Question:** What should the **SUB-TOTAL (Project Team Fees) Excl. VAT** amount reflect? Is that the sum of all the hourly rates of the Project Team Professionals or is it meant to refer to the overall project cost that this **Area of Expertise/Project Role** will contribute for the full project?


***Response:** Pricing schedule has been updated and the second part has been removed.*

- o. **Question:** The sub items below the pricing schedule refer to: “The hours anticipated per individual project team member and costs must be provided” – which portion of the pricing table must these requirements appear in?

***Response:** This has been removed as per addendum 2.*

Regards,

DocuSigned by:

  
 279FD21B7344446...

**NOMA RAKOMA**  
**PROCUREMENT & TENDER OFFICER**  
**SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT**

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT

I (Name)..... hereby acknowledge the existence of  
 Addendum **No 3** on behalf of (Company Name)

.....

\_\_\_\_\_  
**SIGNATURE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**