

Date: 18 August 2025
Email: ZiphoSCM@dbsa.org

Enquiries: Zipho Moselakgomo

Tender Number: RFP061/2025

Tender Description:

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PROVIDER TO ASSIST WITH UNDERTAKING A
BANKABLE
FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ASSIST WITH EXECUTING THE BEITBRIDGE-MUSINA
INTEGRATED WATER SUPPLY SCHEME PROGRAMME

ADDENDUM NO. 01

**AMENDMENT TO THE TENDER DOCUMENT:
THESE CLARIFICATIONS MUST BE READ TO FORM PART OF THE TENDER.**

1. Bid Enquiries and Responses

The responses to queries raised by bidders has been provided as Annexure A to this addendum-bidders are requested to go over all responses.

2. Extension of Tender closing date

The tender has been extended to close on the **05th September 2025 @23:55pm**-all bidders who have sent a request for the link will receive the link for submission by close of business 22 August 2025.

Best Regards,



Zipho Moselakgomo
Procurement Specialist
Supply Chain Management

Annexure A

#	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1	<p>1. Application and Regulatory Submission Costs The Bankable Feasibility Study stage includes support for securing a number of statutory approvals and compliance deliverables—such as the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Water Use License Application (WULA), Water Services Development Plan (WSDP) alignment, servitude agreements, and others. Many of these require payments to third parties (e.g., application fees, licensing charges, legal registration, and technical specialists).</p> <p>Could you please confirm whether these application-related costs should be included in the proposal budget or whether they will be funded separately by the client through special disbursements outside the total contract value?</p>	<p>The cost for human resources/professional team should be in the proposal budget. Other costs, such as application or permit lodging fees, will be catered for in the disbursements.</p>

2	<p>Clarification on the Role of Stage 5 and the Broader Implementation Sequence</p> <p>The ToR states that Stage 5 (Detailed Design) is not part of the scope for this assignment. However, Stage 6—which typically runs concurrently with Stage 5—is not explicitly identified as excluded, nor is its status fully defined in the document.</p> <p>We therefore seek your guidance on the intended implementation structure :</p> <p>1. Is this assignment envisioned as a two-phase contract, where this current procurement covers Stages 1 to 4 (ending at the Bankable Feasibility Study), and a second phase would later be contracted separately—potentially involving the same or a different consultant—for Stages 5 and 6?</p> <p>2. Or is it anticipated that a separate consultant will be brought on board specifically for Stage 5 (Detailed Design), and this current technical assistance provider (selected under this RFP) will continue to lead or support Stage 6 deliverables, such as procurement packaging, transaction support, or implementation readiness?</p>	<p>1) The stage 5 is not part of the scope, it is expected that the successful bidder will incorporate the output of stage 5 into stage 6 as part of a complete Implementation Readiness Study as per the guidelines of the DWS. 2) It is clarified in response 1.</p>
---	---	--

3	<p>Pricing Tables – Stage 5 Detailed Design Omission</p> <p>In the Pricing Table (Annexure A, page 53–54), Stage 5 (Detailed Design) is mentioned in the narrative but is absent from the pricing schedule.</p> <p>Stage 5 (Detailed Design) is referenced in the ToR but not listed in the pricing table. Should bidders include indicative costs for this stage, or can DBSA confirm that it is fully excluded from scope?”</p>	<p>Stage 5 is excluded also refer to previous response.</p>
4	<p>Timeline for Project Phases</p> <p>The ToR outlines a complex multi-stage project (Needs Assessment to Implementation Ready Study) but provides no indicative timeframe for each phase or total project duration. Could DBSA provide indicative timelines for each project stage to guide scheduling in the methodology and pricing proposal?</p>	<p>The team estimates 14 - 16 months, the bidder can determine milestone dates in their work plan based on understanding of what is required per stage of planning</p>

5	<p>Submission Format for Joint Ventures The RFP allows JVs/Consortia but does not clarify if a single pricing schedule or separate breakdowns by partner are expected.</p> <p>1. For joint venture or consortium bidders, should a consolidated pricing schedule be submitted, or are individual partner pricing breakdowns required?</p> <p>2. We would appreciate clarity on how responsibilities will be divided between Stages 4 and 5, and what role (if any) the current assignment is expected to play in coordination with subsequent implementation stages.</p>	<p>1) Consolidated pricing schedule should be submitted. 2) stage 4 is preliminary design under the current RFP, Stage 5 is not part of the RFP, but the work will need to be incorporated as part of the final IRS as per DWS guidelines. The bidder will be expected to provide the necessary information and clarity of how stage 4 was completed to the contracting entity responsible for stage 5 (this is on responsibilities).</p>
6	<p>1. What is the expected completion timeline?</p> <p>2. What are the key milestone dates we should be aware of?</p> <p>3. How is 'local' defined, with regards to the requirement that all subcontractors must be local?</p>	<p>1)The team estimates 14 - 16 months, incorporating the BFI process</p> <p>2)The team estimates 14 - 16 months, the bidder can determine milestone dates in their work plan based on understanding of what is required per stage of planning.</p> <p>3)the condition stated under "Additional conditions of contract" point i and point ii will not be applicable as this bid is for Professional Services</p>
7	<p>Given that many of our professionals hold international credentials, we want to confirm whether it would be acceptable to submit the SAQA evaluation certificate after receiving the contract.</p> <p>Please let us know if this arrangement aligns with your requirements or if the SAQA certificate must be submitted upfront. We appreciate your guidance on this matter and look forward to your response.</p>	<p>According to the SAQA website individuals can get their qualifications evaluated within 48 hours through the special application-therefore bidders should submit the SAQA certificate with all foreign qualifications at tender stage and not at contracting. for more information on SAQA foreign qualifications evaluations please go to this website www.saq.org.za</p>

8	Please can the submission closing date be extended by four (4) weeks to 19 September 2025 so as to allow for us to respond to the RFP comprehensively.	Consideration is on 2 weeks not 4 weeks. Tender will close on the 05th September 2025
---	--	---

9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a project meets the R1bn threshold, but has not yet reached financial closure, will it count towards the bidder experience scoring? 2. Could bidder experience references that are not in the water sector and/or submitted to BFI within RSA be considered in the evaluation? 3. Could references of similar-sized projects in countries other than RSA count towards the bidder's experience scoring? 4. What is the weighting of key personnel across the Qualifications and Skills criteria? For example, does the technical lead's qualification score have the same weight as other key resources? 5. Does an "adequate" methodology rating require a 100% score in all other areas of the functional evaluation to progress to the third evaluation stage? 6. Could you provide a breakdown of the scoring matrix for the methodology criterion to reduce its sensitivity on the overall score? 7. Will a Letter of Good Standing be accepted in lieu of the submission of Financial Statements? 8. Is the proposed fee percentage split across stages in the Deliverable table under Section 1.1.2.1.1 fixed or could the bidder propose the price per stage based on the bidder's estimated effort for that stage? 9. Could geohydrological/geotechnical desktop studies, including topographical surveys, etc., be treated as a provisional sum supplied by the client in the Pricing Schedule? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Only a list of projects with a project value of over R1 billion or above that have reached financial close will be considered under experience, as per the statement in the RFP. 2) Refer to section for BIDDERS EXPERIENCE: TRACK RECORD IN RELEVANT SIMILAR WORK for requirements. 3) Same as previous question, the project outside of SA will count but the rating criteria will be as stipulated in the RFP section. 4) Yes it is equal weighting. 5) To get to next stage the bidder will need to achieve a minimum point of 80%. 6) The methodology is key as outlined in the RFP. The methodology will be assessed in an integrated manner as per the key expectations stated in the RFP 7) No-Financial statements are required. 8) For tendering purposes it is fixed to ensure we can compare apples with apples-however during SLA stage the appointed bidder can enter into discussions for possible consideration. 9. The bidder is expected to cost this items and outline in the methodology and work plan 10. The requirements remain as per the RFP documents 11. The estimated Capex will be determined by the feasibility study based on preliminary designs and research. 12. The existing literature on this project is very limited. 13. Bidders were afforded the opportunity to join a non-compulsory site visit to appreciate the infrastructure requirements. This will be confirmed by the winning bidder as part of the feasibility study 14. The bidder will draft and lead all regulatory submission supported by the DBSA 15. Bidders are encouraged to use their understanding to determine the most competitive and value for money pricing. 16. The broad offtake agreement with Zimbabwe. The feasibility study will provide options and validate this estimate. 17. Conditions for the RFP are stated in the document of the RFP with the DBSA reserving the rights.
---	---	--

	<p>10. Could the qualification requirements for the following personnel be reduced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land Surveyor - Construction Health and Safety Agent <p>11. What is the estimated CAPEX of this project?</p> <p>12. Are there any existing reports and/or studies available for review at this stage?</p> <p>13. Could you provide details on the extent of infrastructure for water treatment works, ancillary infrastructure, and water supply infrastructure?</p> <p>14. Regarding "detailing and assisting with the submissions for.... EIA," what is the expectation? Will the bidder need to conduct a full EIA or provide input to an EIA?</p> <p>15. Could the EIA be treated as a provisional sum item, with an environmental screening exercise included in the technical workstream?</p> <p>16. What is the basis for the 41ML/d capacity specified in the introduction of Part D: ToR & Project Brief?</p> <p>17. Are there any Special Conditions of Contract (SCC) applicable to this RfP?</p> <p>18. Item 35.2.11 under "Mandatory Questions" conflicts with section 26.5 "Third Stage: Financial Offer and Preference". The conflict is price and preference evaluation stated as 80:20 in the former and 90:10 in the latter. Please indicate which one is correct?</p>	<p>18. This is an error-the correct price and preference evaluation is 90/10</p>
--	---	--

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF: Tender Number: RFP061/2025

AMENDMENT TO THE TENDER DOCUMENT:
THESE CLARIFICATIONS MUST BE READ TO FORM PART OF TENDER NO.

I (Name)..... hereby acknowledge the existence of
addendum No 1 on behalf of (Company Name)

.....

Signature. _____

Date _____



M Janse van Rensburg (Interim Board Chairman),
P Nqeto (Board Deputy Chairman)

B Mosako* (Chief Executive), K Brown, B Hore, D Lerutla, MP Matji,
D Makhura, Z Mbele*, D Moephuli, J Muthige, C Naidoo, J Netshitenzhe,
B Nqwababa, E Pieterse

*Executive
Bathobile Sowazi (Company Secretary)

1258 Lever Rd,
Headway Hill,
Midrand,
1685

011 313 3911
011 313 3500
www.dbsa.org