**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR**
**RFP075-2025 TENDER BRIEFING SESSION (OLIFANTSFONTEIN) &**
**RFP076-2025 TENDER BRIEFING SESSION (WATERVAL)**

**DATE; 20 NOVEMBER 2025**

**VERSION 8**

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM A**

**Teaming Arrangements:** In relation to the teaming arrangement among the technical disciplines (Engineering, legal and financial firms), Is it possible for a legal firm using different teams to support more than one consortium or Bid? i.e Legal firm A is supporting Bid 1 using team X and Legal firm A is supporting Bid 2 using team y?

**Response:** Yes

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM B**

**1. Project Duration Inconsistency**

- **Issue:** Section 1.3 (*Staged Approach*, p. 31) specifies *Stages 1 and 2* must be completed within **18 months**, while Section 3.1 (*Introduction*, p. 33) limits total contract duration to **10 months** and requires bidders to propose a schedule of **8 months or less**.
- **Question:** Please confirm the expected **total duration** for the assignment Stages 1 and 2 is 8 months, 10 months, or 18 months. Please confirm expected duration of Stage 3.

**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
- The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder.

**2. Environmental & Social Authorisations**

- **Issue:** Section 3.5 Task 7.3 (p. 39–41) requires the Transaction Advisor to "complete all necessary applications and processes and support the Project Owner to acquire the Environmental Authorisation (EA) and Water Use Licence (WULA)."
- **Question:** Please clarify whether the Transaction Advisor is expected to **lead and secure** these permits (acting as the EAP and applicant) or merely **provide technical input and coordination** while ERWAT/WPO act as applicant.

**Response:** TA to lead and secure these permits acting as the EAP and applicant.

**3. Existing Studies and Data Access**

- **Issue:** Multiple sections (p. 34 and p. 47) reference the *Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study 2017 – Wayo Consulting* as a baseline to "reduce duplication of work and cost."
- **Question:** Will this report and supporting data be **made available to bidders before submission** or only **after award**?

**Response:** The report is made available to all bidders but it should be noted that the report is dated and new information and approaches will have to be investigated as part of this assignment. The scope of work of this assignment is to also consider the upgrade and refurbishment of the existing WWTW, energy generation and sludge beneficiation.

**4. Stakeholder and Community Engagement**

- **Issue:** Section 3.4 Task 6 (p. 38) directs the Transaction Advisor to "conduct meetings with the community and organised labour."
- **Question:** Should bidders include **logistical costs** (venue hire, notices, translation, facilitation, recording) in their price, or will these be covered by the Project Owner/WPO?

**Response:** Bidders to include **logistical costs** (venue hire, notices, translation, facilitation, recording

**5. Implementation Stage Scope**

- **Issue:** Section 3.6 (p. 42–44) states that if implementation proceeds, the TA must provide "technical, legal, and financial transaction advisory support for procurement of contractor(s)."
- **Question:** Does Stage 3 extend **through to financial close and contract signing**, or only until the **preferred bidder is recommended**?

**Response:** Until the preferred bidder is recommended

**6. Sludge Beneficiation and Energy Generation**

- **Issue:** Section 3.2 (p. 33–34) requires assessing sludge beneficiation and possible energy generation "for own consumption."
- **Question:** Should bidders include **conceptual design and costing** for sludge-to-energy solutions within the BFS scope, or is this limited to high-level feasibility commentary?

**Response:** Bidders should include **conceptual design and costing** for sludge-to-energy solutions within the BFS scope.

**7. Scope of Financial Modelling**

- **Issue:** Section 3.5 Task 8 (p. 41) states the TA must undertake "full value assessment and financial viability including funding models and reuse water pricing."

- **Question:** Should the financial model include **full sensitivity analyses and debt-equity structuring for potential PPP models**, or only a **basic municipal affordability model**?

**Response:** Financial model should include full sensitivity analyses and debt-equity structuring for potential PPP/project finance models.

**8. Coordination Between Project Owner and WPO**

- **Issue:** Section 4.5 (p. 48) says both entities will approve deliverables and manage payments.
- **Question:** Please confirm who will be the **day-to-day point of contact** for scope approvals and clarifications — WPO, ERWAT (Project Owner), or both jointly.

**Response:** The day-to-day point of contact for scope approvals and clarifications will be a Project Steering Committee comprising WPO, DBSA, Rand Water Services and ERWAT

**9. Missing Annexes (Bankable Feasibility Study Content and Supporting ToRs)**

- **Issue:**
  The RFP repeatedly references several annexes that are **not included** in the provided 73-page document. Specifically, on **page 48 (end of Part E)**, the following annexes are listed as part of the Terms of Reference but are missing from the file:
  1. **Annex B:** *Table of Contents of the Bankable Feasibility Study* (explicitly referenced on p. 31 and p. 35 as defining the BFS deliverable structure).
  2. **Annex C:** *Terms of Reference – Technical Options*.
  3. **Annex D:** *Terms of Reference – Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)*.
  4. **Annex E:** *Terms of Reference – Socio-Economic Analysis*.
  5. **Annex F:** *Gender Action Plan*.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm whether these annexes will be **issued as addenda or shared separately** (e.g., via OneDrive or clarification notice). If not, should bidders rely on their **own standard frameworks** for:
  - Bankable Feasibility Study structure and contents (Annex B),
  - Technical and environmental analysis scopes (Annex C–E), and
  - Gender and social inclusion requirements (Annex F)?

**Response:** Annexes are provided on the advertisement and tender portals.

**10. Budget Indication and Remuneration Structure**

- **Issue:**
  The remuneration schedule (pp. 46–47) allocates fixed percentages per deliverable under each stage (e.g., "Mobilisation 10%," "Inception Report 20%"), but the RFP does **not disclose an indicative overall budget or ceiling amount** for the assignment.
- **Question:**

Could DBSA please **indicate the total estimated or indicative budget range** for this engagement to enable bidders to ensure realistic and comparable pricing?

**Response:** No, the budget cannot be made available. This is a competitive bidding process and bidders need to tender their cost to perform the work

**11. Presentation of Reimbursable and Disbursement Costs**

- **Issue:**
  Section 4.4 (p. 47–48) requires bidders to "propose a ceiling for disbursements" and notes that pre-approved travel and related expenses will be reimbursed at cost. It is unclear whether these costs should be itemised or integrated into the total bid price.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm whether the **total reimbursable/disbursement budget** should be **presented as a separate line item** or **built into the total contract budget**, with only an **indication of the ceiling for disbursements** required in the proposal.

**Response:** Total reimbursable/disbursement budget should be presented as a separate line item – see proposed pricing Schedule.

**12. Termination and Payment for Work Done**

- **Issue:**
  Section 1.3 (p. 31) allows WPO to terminate the Transaction Advisor's appointment "at the end of any stage, or sooner if reasonably required, without any additional remuneration other than that priced for and delivered."
- **Question:**
  Please clarify whether the consultant will be **compensated for partially completed deliverables** at the point of termination, or only for **fully completed milestones** approved by WPO.

**Response:** Fully completed milestones approved by WPO.

**13. Insurance Requirements**

- **Issue:**
  The responsiveness checklist (p. 19) lists **Professional Indemnity Insurance** as a pre-qualifier but does not specify a minimum cover value.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm the **minimum level of professional indemnity insurance** required (e.g., R5 million / R10 million) and whether this applies **per project or in aggregate**.

**Response:** Minimum level of professional indemnity insurance – R5 million

**14. Clarification on Support Team Size Requirement**

- **Issue:**

Under the functional evaluation criteria (Stage 2 – Experience of Key Resources, p. 24), the scoring table for the "Support Team" category awards the highest score ("Very Good") where "more than 4 proposed resources per field" are provided. However, it is unclear whether this requirement refers to **more than four team members per discipline** (i.e., Engineering, Finance, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Legal) or **more than four support staff in total** across all disciplines.

- **Question:** Please confirm whether the "more than 4 proposed resources per field" requirement applies **per discipline** or to the **aggregate total** number of support team members proposed.

**Response:** Applies to the support team members in the priority disciplines of engineering, finance, cost benefit analysis and legal.

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM C**

**Issue #1:** Two different timelines are specified. Stage Gates state Stages 1–2 must be completed "within a maximum of 18 calendar months" (p. 32), while Section 3.1 later says "total contract duration is 10 months… bidder to complete in a maximum of 8 months" (p. 34–36).
**Question:** Please confirm the expected **total duration** for the assignment Stages 1 and 2 is 8 months, 10 months, or 18 months. Please confirm expected duration of Stage 3.
**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
- The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder.

**Issue #2:** Meeting cadence conflicts. Section 2.2 requires **quarterly** Steering Committee meetings (p. 32–33), yet Task 2.2 specifies up to **36 PSC meetings** plus **6 ad-hoc meetings** during development (p. 37).
**Question:** Please confirm the expected frequency and **maximum number** of PSC/ad-hoc meetings.
**Response:** Minimum once per monthly Steering Committee Meeting.

**Issue #3:** Progress reporting cadence conflicts. Section 2.3 requires **monthly progress reports** within 7 days of month-end and notes **biannual WRP** reporting (p. 33). Task 2.5 then requires **quarterly** progress reports within 30 days of quarter-end (p. 37).
**Question:** Which reporting cadence applies (monthly vs quarterly), and how should biannual WRP reporting be integrated to avoid duplication?
**Response:** Monthly progress reports within 7 days of month-end. Biannual WRP reports are a summary of monthly progress reports.

**Issue #3:** Scope implies the TA must support environmental approvals but does not state whether **final permits** must be secured within Stage 2. Task 7.3 requires scoping and completing "applications and processes" for **EA** and **WULA** and alignment with **DBSA ESS, IFC PS, GCF** (p. 41–42).
**Question:** For Stage 2, are we required to (a) submit complete EA/WULA applications, (b) obtain the **issued** EA and WULA, or (c) prepare the studies and draft applications only? Please also confirm who will be the legal "applicant/holder."
**Response:** TA to lead and secure these permits acting as the EAP and applicant.

**Issue #3:** Brine/concentrate and sludge management are flagged as key issues (p. 35–36) but responsibilities are not explicit.
**Question:** Should the BFS define and cost the **preferred brine disposal route** (incl. permits, pipelines, or 3rd-party contracts) and a **sludge beneficiation** solution to FID-level, or only to concept/pre-feasibility with option comparison?
**Response:** Bidders should include **conceptual design and costing** for sludge beneficiation, energy generation solutions and brine/concentrate management and disposal within the BFS scope.

**Issue #4:** Capacity and phasing. The existing WWTW is 105 MLD AADWF; the **ultimate** reuse facility is 70 MLD and the **land layout** should cater for 70 MLD (p. 34–35).
**Question:** Should the BFS recommend a **phased capacity plan** (e.g., 20–35–70 MLD modules) with staging and triggers, and size shared infrastructure for ultimate 70 MLD?
**Response:** TA to propose the best technical option.

**Issue #5:** Preliminary design depth. Task 4.3 requires a **high-level preliminary design** and **BoQ** for the selected option (plus an alternative), including distribution and storage (p. 39).
**Question:** What design maturity is expected (e.g., **~10% design / Class 4 estimate**)? Are **site surveys** (topographic, geotech, utilities) and pilot testing within scope or provided by the Project Owner?
**Response:** Design maturity expected is ~10% design / Class 4 estimate**.**

**Issue #5:** Off-take commitments. Demand Analysis and the Stage-2 schedule reference customer profiles, water quality requirements, and "off-take agreements" (pp. 34, 49).
**Question:** By the time of the **final BFS**, are **binding** off-take agreements required, or are **MoUs/term sheets** sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals?
**Response:** MoUs/term sheets are sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals

**Issue #6:** Implementation boundary. Stage 3 includes preparing tender documents, supporting the bidding process and negotiations, and a management/monitoring plan (pp. 44–46), but construction phase roles aren't stated.
**Question:** Does the TA's scope **end at contract award/financial close**, or must the TA provide **employer's agent/owner's engineer** support during construction and commissioning?
**Response:** Until the preferred bidder is recommended.

**Issue #7** Stakeholder engagement and GBV/SEAH. Task 7.3 requires **grievance redress mechanisms**, **GBV/SEAH risk assessment**, and **training** for staff/contractors and community awareness (p. 42).
**Question:** Should the TA **deliver and facilitate training/awareness sessions** during the assignment or only develop the **plans, tools, and curricula** for the Project Owner/ contractors to implement?
**Response:** Develop the plans, tools, and curricula for the Project Owner/ contractors to implement

**Issue #8:** Background studies. Multiple places instruct bidders to rely on the **2017 EIDP Feasibility Study** to "reduce duplication of work and cost" (pp. 36, 49–50).
**Question:** Will the **full datasets** and models from the 2017 study (and any subsequent updates) be provided in editable formats at inception, and can we assume no IP restrictions on reuse within this assignment? Can these studies be obtained now?
**Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM D**

1. Please share the prefeasibility study prepared by Wayo Consulting as is referred to in the tender documents as being "*Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study: Wastewater Reclamation Programme November 2017– Prepared by Wayo Consulting*". This will really assist bidders to accurately scope and price the work that still needs to be done.

   **Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

2. Do you have a view on whether the PPP should be responsible for just the reclamation plant or could the PPP also takeover the operation of the existing wastewater treatment plant given the dependency between the plants?
   **Response:** All options should be investigated and a preferred option recommended and designed.

3. Do you have a demand assessment that anticipates the offtakers of the treated wastewater from the reclamation plant?
   **Response:** Industries in the area, Rand Water and Metro - MoUs/term sheets are sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals

4. If yes to the above, can you give a high-level overview of who they are? For example, are they domestic users who will be supplied by Ekhurhuleni municipality or do they also include industries who need either cooling water or a higher quality process water? If industries are included, do you have an indication of their respective water quality needs already?

**Response:** Industries in the area, Rand Water and Metro - MoUs/term sheets are sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals

5. We note that Rand Water has been listed together with ERWAT as 'Project Owner'. Can you clarify what is the role of Rand Water? Are they a potential offtaker?
   **Response:** Rand Water is a potential offtaker but also possible implementer through a SPV structure. All options to be investigated and preferred option recommended and designed

6. Can the current nature of effluent input and output (quality/quantity data) and profile of discharge (by source- domestic/ industries including type) be provided. This will help in identifying the existing challenges and tailor the A&M
   **Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

7. What is the quality of water demanded by the offtakers in general? Is the authority envisaging Reverse Osmosis to be used?
8. **Response:** All options to be investigated.

9. Evaluation of Experience of the Tenderer's Proposed Key Resources / Experts: As per RFP all experts should have professional registration with a relevant professional body and qualify NQF level. In addition, their experience is also suggested post- registration, with minimum number of years post-registration experience critical to obtain the functionality points. In the interest of various international experts (for non-engineering expertise) not belonging to South Africa, we request you relax this requirement and allow citation of professional experience irrespective of NQF/ registration as these are SA specific requirements.
   **Response:** No relaxation will be provided – refer to updated evaluation criteria

10. The Transaction Advisor must accept liability for losses caused to the Project Owner by any negligent acts, errors or omissions made by the Transaction Advisor during the Project. (Page 48): We propose that Liability to be capped to the quantum of the project fees. Please confirm if this is in order.
    **Response:**Liability will be capped at value of TA fees

11. Evaluation criteria: experience/track record of the tenderer:

a. Can the experience of proposed subconsultants also be included within the submission?
   **Response:** Yes

b. Are the amounts (rand value) of the projects based on the proposed capital value of projects as per previous bankable studies undertaken? (i.e. not all bankable studies proceed to implementation).
   **Response:** Project estimates will have to be updated and will be based on the outcome of the bankable feasibility study undertaken by the successful bidder

12. Timelines for the work to be undertaken:

c. Page 32 (of 74) states that Stage 1 (Inception) and Stage 2 (Bankable full feasibility) shall be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.

d. Page 34 (of 74) states that the total contract duration is 10 months; and that the bidder shall submit a timeline showing how the project will be completed in a maximum of 8 months.

e. Please clarify the actual timelines applicable, as the above are contradictory

**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
- The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder.

13. In terms of the preference point system of 80/20, kindly confirm if the 20 points is only for BBBEE status of the bidder; as actual 'specific goals' have not been explicitly mentioned?

**Response:** Specific goal is the BBBEE level.

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM E**

1. The maximum points allocated to Evaluation Criteria No 2 (Experience / Track Record of the Tenderer) on page 24 of 70 are 25 points. However, the breakdown of the said criteria indicates 31.5 & 35 points for Good and Very Good respectively.
   **Response:** Check Evaluation Criteria Update

2. The maximum obtainable points of sub-item 2 (Engineer) is 7.5 points VS 5 points obtainable for Very Good Engineer with 20 years or more experience post professional registration.
   **Response:** Check Evaluation Criteria Update

3. The contract for this tender is stated to be the General Conditions of Contract as prescribed by the National Treasury: Clause 7 states that the performance security is to be provided within 30 days on receipt of award by the successful bidder. Kindly advise if that shall be applicable for a Professional Services contract as nothing was noted in this regard under Special Conditions of Contract.
   **Response:** Yes

4. Do you strictly require reference letters as evidence of the experience track record or any documentation shall be acceptable?
   **Response:** Reference letters are required.

5. With reference to Activity 12.6, the scope notes the preparation of a Value for Money analysis; however, it does not specify whether the advisor will be required to take part in

the bid evaluation process. As the bid evaluation informs the VFM report, kindly confirm whether bid evaluation support will form part of the advisor’s responsibilities.
**Response:** Yes

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM F**

1. Are all disciplines required within a bid, or can we choose from the list and opt not to bid for all disciplines?
   **Response:** All disciplines are required in the bid

2. The maximum points allocation for the bidder’s experience varies within the document. On page 20, it is listed as 25 points, while on page 22, it is 35 points. Could you confirm which one is correct? We are assuming the 25 points is accurate to ensure a total of 100 points for the overall evaluation. If this is the case, ratings on page 22 would need adjustments.
   **Response:** Check Evaluation Criteria Update

3. There is a discrepancy regarding the "period for which bids are required to remain open for acceptance." On page 1, it is mentioned as 120 days from the closing date, whereas on page 18, it is noted as 90 days. Please confirm which duration is correct?
   **Response:** Bid validity is 120 days

4. The evaluation criteria for "Quality Management Policies" are not included in the document. We are uncertain about what to submit, such as a Quality plan and/or ISO certificate. Could you advise on this.
   **Response:** Standards explained in evaluation criteria - SANS 9000 / ISO 9001 certified.

5. Is it permissible for the same resource to be used for two different disciplines if they hold the qualifications and experience for both.
   **Response:** Bidders may propose a specialist to perform more than one role but a minimum of 7 resources will be required

6. The document does not specify the councils that the Risk Management Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement Specialist, and Cost Benefit Analysis & Socio-Economic Impact Analysis Specialist should be registered with, where the other disciplines are clear. Could you provide this information?
   **Response:** For Risk Management Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement Specialist, and Cost Benefit Analysis & Socio-Economic Impact Analysis Specialist the CV’s must demonstrate each specialist has the required experience to complete the assignment.

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM G**

1. The above RFP makes several references to a document entitled “Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study: Wastewater Reclamation Programme November 2017” – Prepared by Wayo Consulting. Please share this document with Bidders.
   **Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

2. Part E - Annex A refers to Design Reports and technical information being available. Please share this information with Bidders.

   **Response:** Detailed reports and information will be made available to the successful bidder.

3. Under "Evaluation of Proposed Methodology and Approach, Page 21, and Paragraph 5 of Section 1.3 on page 31 stipulates a timeline of "18 months".

   The last paragraph of Section 3.1 on page 33 suggests "The total contract duration is 10 months from acceptance ...". Please clarify the discrepancy.

   **Response:**

   - Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
   - ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.

     The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

4. Section 3.4.3 – Remuneration Schedule. Please advise if we can propose an alternative schedule (split per stage) with our bid.

   **Response:** The remuneration schedule has to be completed. An alternative proposal can be made in addition.

5. On page 56, after "Email: inforeg@justice.gov.za" there is a heading entitled "Fees and Assumptions". Please advise if there is some information missing after this heading. You showed a version of the requirements in your presentation – and I assume these will be issued with the Tender notice shortly.

   **Response:** This is errata.  Wording of "fees and assumptions" can be ignored

6. Annexure F on page 70 refers to Annexure H. Should this be Annexure F?

   **Response:** This should be Annexure F

7. For the Project Manager / Team Leader position, is it possible for us to offer a Mechanical engineer.

   **Response:** Refer to amended evaluation criteria

8. The scoring of experience for the Engineer: Wastewater treatment / reuse needs to be adjusted to align with the 7.5 maximum score.

   **Response:** See amended evaluation criteria

9. We have individuals with significant qualifications and experience, but they registered as professionals late in their careers for various reasons. Please advise if the scoring must be assessed from date of professional registration.

   **Response**: The scoring will be assessed from date of professional registration

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM H**

Would appointment for the required transactional advisory services disqualify a company for qualifying for the potential future design project when the project is implemented?

**Response:** Yes

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM I**

**Issue #1**: Meeting cadence conflicts. Section 2.2 requires quarterly Steering Committee meetings (p. 32–33), yet Task 2.2 specifies up to 36 PSC meetings plus 6 ad-hoc meetings during development (p. 37).

**Question:** Please confirm the expected frequency and maximum number of PSC/ad-hoc meetings.

**Response:** Minimum once per monthly Steering Committee Meeting.

**Issue #2:** Progress reporting cadence conflicts. Section 2.3 requires monthly progress reports within 7 days of month-end and notes biannual WRP reporting (p. 33). Task 2.5 then requires quarterly progress reports within 30 days of quarter-end (p. 37).

Question: Which reporting cadence applies (monthly vs quarterly), and how should biannual WRP reporting be integrated to avoid duplication?

**Response:** Monthly progress reports within 7 days of month-end. Biannual WRP reports are a summary of monthly progress report

**Issue #3:** Scope implies the TA must support environmental approvals but does not state whether final permits must be secured within Stage 2. Task 7.3 requires scoping and completing "applications and processes" for EA and WULA and alignment with DBSA ESS, IFC PS, GCF (p. 41–42).

**Question:** For Stage 2, are we required to (a) submit complete EA/WULA applications, (b) obtain the issued EA and WULA, or (c) prepare the studies and draft applications only? Please also confirm who will be the legal "applicant/holder."

**Response:** TA to lead and secure these permits acting as the EAP and applicant

**Issue #4:** Brine/concentrate and sludge management are flagged as key issues (p. 35–36) but responsibilities are not explicit.

**Question:** Should the BFS define and cost the preferred brine disposal route (incl. permits, pipelines, or 3rd-party contracts) and a sludge beneficiation solution to FID-level, or only to concept/pre-feasibility with option comparison?

**Response:** Bidders should include conceptual design and costing for sludge beneficiation, energy generation solutions and brine/concentrate management and disposal within the BFS scope.

**Issue #5:** Capacity and phasing. The existing WWTW is 105 MLD AADWF; the ultimate reuse facility is 70 MLD and the land layout should cater for 70 MLD (p. 34–35).

**Question:** Should the BFS recommend a phased capacity plan (e.g., 20–35–70 MLD modules) with staging and triggers, and size shared infrastructure for ultimate 70 MLD?

**Response:** TA to propose the best technical option.

**Issue #6:** Preliminary design depth. Task 4.3 requires a high-level preliminary design and BoQ for the selected option (plus an alternative), including distribution and storage (p. 39).
**Question:** What design maturity is expected (e.g., ~10% design / Class 4 estimate)? Are site surveys (topographic, geotech, utilities) and pilot testing within scope or provided by the Project Owner?
**Response:** Design maturity expected is ~10% design / Class 4 estimate

**Issue #7:** Off-take commitments. Demand Analysis and the Stage-2 schedule reference customer profiles, water quality requirements, and "off-take agreements" (pp. 34, 49).
**Question:** By the time of the final BFS, are binding off-take agreements required, or are MoUs/term sheets sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals?
**Response:** MoUs/term sheets are sufficient for bankability and "in-principle" approvals

**Issue #8:** Implementation boundary. Stage 3 includes preparing tender documents, supporting the bidding process and negotiations, and a management/monitoring plan (pp. 44–46), but construction phase roles aren't stated.
**Question:** Does the TA's scope end at contract award/financial close, or must the TA provide employer's agent/owner's engineer support during construction and commissioning?
**Response:** Until the preferred bidder is recommended

**Issue #9:** Stakeholder engagement and GBV/SEAH. Task 7.3 requires grievance redress mechanisms, GBV/SEAH risk assessment, and training for staff/contractors and community awareness (p. 42).
**Question:** Should the TA deliver and facilitate training/awareness sessions during the assignment or only develop the plans, tools, and curricula for the Project Owner/contractors to implement?
**Response:** Develop the plans, tools, and curricula for the Project Owner/ contractors to implement

**Issue #10:** Background studies. Multiple places instruct bidders to rely on the 2017 EIDP Feasibility Study to "reduce duplication of work and cost" (pp. 36, 49–50).
**Question:** Will the full datasets and models from the 2017 study (and any subsequent updates) be provided in editable formats at inception, and can we assume no IP restrictions on reuse within this assignment? Can these studies be obtained now?
**Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM J**

**1. Project Duration Inconsistency**
**Issue:** Section 1.3 (Staged Approach, p. 31) specifies Stages 1 and 2 must be completed within 18 months, while Section 3.1 (Introduction, p. 33) limits total contract duration to 10 months and requires bidders to propose a schedule of 8 months or less. Question: Please confirm the

expected total duration for the assignment Stages 1 and 2 is 8 months, 10 months, or 18 months. Please confirm expected duration of Stage 3.

**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
  The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

**2. Environmental & Social Authorisations**

**Issue:** Section 3.5 Task 7.3 (p. 39–41) requires the Transaction Advisor to "complete all necessary applications and processes and support the Project Owner to acquire the Environmental Authorisation (EA) and Water Use Licence (WULA)." Question: Please clarify whether the Transaction Advisor is expected to lead and secure these permits (acting as the EAP and applicant) or merely provide technical input and coordination while ERWAT/WPO act as applicant.

**Response:** TA to lead and secure these permits acting as the EAP and applicant

**3. Existing Studies and Data Access**

**Issue:** Multiple sections (p. 34 and p. 47) reference the Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study 2017 – Wayo Consulting as a baseline to "reduce duplication of work and cost." Question: Will this report and supporting data be made available to bidders before submission or only after award?

**Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

---

**4. Stakeholder and Community Engagement**

**Issue:** Section 3.4 Task 6 (p. 38) directs the Transaction Advisor to "conduct meetings with the community and organised labour." Question: Should bidders include logistical costs (venue hire, notices, translation, facilitation, recording) in their price, or will these be covered by the Project Owner/WPO?

**Response:** Bidders to include logistical costs (venue hire, notices, translation, facilitation, recording

**5. Implementation Stage Scope**

**Issue:** Section 3.6 (p. 42–44) states that if implementation proceeds, the TA must provide "technical, legal, and financial transaction advisory support for procurement of contractor(s)."

**Question:** Does Stage 3 extend through to financial close and contract signing, or only until the preferred bidder is recommended?

**Response:** Until the preferred bidder is recommended

**6. Sludge Beneficiation and Energy Generation**

**Issue:** Section 3.2 (p. 33–34) requires assessing sludge beneficiation and possible energy generation "for own consumption."

**Question:** Should bidders include conceptual design and costing for sludge-to-energy solutions within the BFS scope, or is this limited to high-level feasibility commentary?

**Response:** Bidders should include **conceptual design and costing** for sludge-to-energy solutions within the BFS scope

**7. Scope of Financial Modelling**
**Issue:** Section 3.5 Task 8 (p. 41) states the TA must undertake "full value assessment and financial viability including funding models and reuse water pricing."
**Question:** Should the financial model include full sensitivity analyses and debt-equity structuring for potential PPP models, or only a basic municipal affordability model?
**Response:** Financial model should include full sensitivity analyses and debt-equity structuring for potential PPP/project finance models

**8. Coordination Between Project Owner and WPO**
**Issue:** Section 4.5 (p. 48) says both entities will approve deliverables and manage payments.
**Question:** Please confirm who will be the day-to-day point of contact for scope approvals and clarifications — WPO, ERWAT (Project Owner), or both jointly.
**Response:** The day-to-day point of contact for scope approvals and clarifications will be a Project Steering Committee comprising WPO, DBSA, Rand Water Services and ERWAT

**9. Missing Annexes (Bankable Feasibility Study Content and Supporting ToRs)**

- **Issue:**
  The RFP repeatedly references several annexes that are **not included** in the provided 73-page document. Specifically, on **page 48 (end of Part E)**, the following annexes are listed as part of the Terms of Reference but are missing from the file:
  1. **Annex B:** *Table of Contents of the Bankable Feasibility Study* (explicitly referenced on p. 31 and p. 35 as defining the BFS deliverable structure).
  2. **Annex C:** *Terms of Reference – Technical Options*.
  3. **Annex D:** *Terms of Reference – Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)*.
  4. **Annex E:** *Terms of Reference – Socio-Economic Analysis*.
  5. **Annex F:** *Gender Action Plan*.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm whether these annexes will be **issued as addenda or shared separately** (e.g., via OneDrive or clarification notice). If not, should bidders rely on their **own standard frameworks** for:
  - Bankable Feasibility Study structure and contents (Annex B),
  - Technical and environmental analysis scopes (Annex C–E), and
  - Gender and social inclusion requirements (Annex F)?

**Response:** Annexes are provided on the advertisement and tender portals.

**10. Budget Indication and Remuneration Structure**

- **Issue:**
  The remuneration schedule (pp. 46–47) allocates fixed percentages per deliverable under each stage (e.g., "Mobilisation 10%," "Inception Report 20%"), but the RFP does **not disclose an indicative overall budget or ceiling amount** for the assignment.
- **Question:**

Could DBSA please **indicate the total estimated or indicative budget range** for this engagement to enable bidders to ensure realistic and comparable pricing?

**Response:** No, the budget cannot be made available. This is a competitive bidding process and bidders need to tender their cost to perform the work

**11. Presentation of Reimbursable and Disbursement Costs**

- **Issue:**
  Section 4.4 (p. 47–48) requires bidders to "propose a ceiling for disbursements" and notes that pre-approved travel and related expenses will be reimbursed at cost. It is unclear whether these costs should be itemised or integrated into the total bid price.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm whether the **total reimbursable/disbursement budget** should be **presented as a separate line item** or **built into the total contract budget**, with only an **indication of the ceiling for disbursements** required in the proposal.

**Response:** Total reimbursable/disbursement budget should be presented as a separate line item – see proposed pricing Schedule.

**12. Termination and Payment for Work Done**

- **Issue:**
  Section 1.3 (p. 31) allows WPO to terminate the Transaction Advisor's appointment "at the end of any stage, or sooner if reasonably required, without any additional remuneration other than that priced for and delivered."
- **Question:**
  Please clarify whether the consultant will be **compensated for partially completed deliverables** at the point of termination, or only for **fully completed milestones** approved by WPO.

**Response:** Fully completed milestones approved by the Project Steering Committee.

**13. Insurance Requirements**

- **Issue:**
  The responsiveness checklist (p. 19) lists **Professional Indemnity Insurance** as a pre-qualifier but does not specify a minimum cover value.
- **Question:**
  Please confirm the **minimum level of professional indemnity insurance** required (e.g., R5 million / R10 million) and whether this applies **per project or in aggregate**.

**Response:** Minimum level of professional indemnity insurance – R5 million

**14. Clarification on Support Team Size Requirement**

- **Issue:**
  Under the functional evaluation criteria (Stage 2 – Experience of Key Resources, p. 24), the scoring table for the "Support Team" category awards the highest score ("Very Good")

where “more than 4 proposed resources per field” are provided. However, it is unclear whether this requirement refers to **more than four team members per discipline** (i.e., Engineering, Finance, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Legal) or **more than four support staff in total** across all disciplines.

- **Question:** Please confirm whether the “more than 4 proposed resources per field” requirement applies **per discipline** or to the **aggregate total** number of support team members proposed.

**Response:** Applies to the support team members in the priority disciplines of engineering, finance, cost benefit analysis and legal.

---

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM J**

| Item | Query |
|---|---|
| Tender Briefing Presentations | Please share the presentations made by DBSA and WPO at the tender briefing sessions<br>**Response:** Presentations will be shared |
| Briefing Session Attendance | To qualify for submission of the tender, shall any of the companies in the JV, Consortium or Association need to have attended the Briefing Session or only the Lead Tenderer?<br>**Response:** Lead Tenderer must have attended the briefing session |
| Key Resources | Can the following roles be assigned to the same key resources:<br>Risk Management Specialist<br>Municipal Finance / Infrastructure<br>Investment Analysis and Project Finance / financial modelling Expert<br>**Response:** Yes |
| Supporting Team Resources | Is there a requirement for supporting resources for the Risk Management Specialist?<br>**Response:** The Tenderer must demonstrate that the Risk Management Specialist has the required experience and support if needed |
| Team Leader | Given that this tender is for a bankable feasibility start, please advise if the Team Leader can be a Financial Expert instead of an Engineer.<br>**Response:** See amended Evaluation Criteria |
| BFI Application | Will the TA be expected/required to complete the BFI application?<br>**Response:** No |

**SET QUESTIONS – FROM K**

"At compulsory briefing on 14/11/2025, it was indicated that the duration for all three Stages of the assignment is 18 Months. Given that the timeframe for ESIA (to IFC standards) and permitting can involve a minimum duration of 12 Months, please can you confirm the maximum timeframe of the assignment for all three Stages 1, 2 and 3. Please also confirm that the Transaction Advisor is expected to obtain permitting and necessary authorizations within the assignment timeframe."

**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
  The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

**Appointment of transaction advisors to Undertake Bankable Feasibility Studies for the Waterval WWTW reuse project.**
**&**
**Appointment of transaction advisors to Undertake Bankable Feasibility Studies for the Olifantsfontein WWTW reuse project.**

We refer to Clause 26.1.2 (functionality criteria) for track record of tenderer described on page 22 of 73. There following clarification is requested in terms table:

**Clarification 1:**

Can the Employer please define what is meant by …***successfully*** *provided professional services in the development…*". Does "successfully" imply that the project was implemented (i.e., constructed) or does this refer to an approved report, or approved for funding, etc.?

**Response:** This refers to an approved report

**Clarification 2:**

The table requires experience in Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects of similar size and nature, as stipulated in the tender documentation.

Upon review, we wish to respectfully submit that it may not be feasible for local firms to fully comply with this requirement as currently framed. To our knowledge, no PPP projects of comparable scale and nature - specifically within the wastewater treatment or water-reuse domain - have been implemented in South Africa over the past **15 years**. As a result, the current criterion may unintentionally disadvantage otherwise capable and experienced local firms who possess substantial PPP experience in other infrastructure sectors, as well as extensive design experience on large-scale wastewater or reuse treatment facilities.

In order to uphold competitiveness, maintain the integrity of the evaluation process, and ensure broader participation from suitably qualified South African firms, we kindly request that the Employer reconsider the current scoring criterion. We propose that the PPP and experience and WWTW or reuse be decoupled. An example of the revised wording is listed below for your consideration:

"Has experience in PPP projects (of any nature) and has design experience on wastewater treatment or reuse facilities with a combined capital value between R500 million to 1,000 million or greater."

Should this not be possible we request that the experience time frame be increased from **15 years to 25 years**.
**Response:** Refer to amended evaluation criteria

**Clarification 3:**
The scoring defined in the abovementioned table does not align with the scoring listed in the first table on Page 20 of 73. Please confirm which scoring is correct.

We would appreciate the Employer's confirmation or further guidance in this regard.
**Response:** See amended Evaluation Criteria

---

**SET QUESTION – FROM L**

In the event that the bidder is responding to both 2 x DBSA Transaction Advisor bids for Waterval and Olifantsfontein due on December 5th, is the bidder required to submit separate project teams for each bid?
**Response:** Submitting the same team for both bids would impact on capacity to execute. The Tenderer must demonstrate it has the capacity to complete both projects in 18 months.

In the event that the bidder elects to submit the same team for both Waterval and Olifantsfontein tenders due Dec 5th, please can you confirm that the said bidder will only be eligible to be awarded only one those tenders.
**Response:** It will be the DBSA's decision whether they will appoint to separate bidders or one bidder for both projects..

Please confirm that the Lead Transaction Advisor can be an engineering firm that enters into sub-contracting arrangement(s) with other specialised firm(s) whereby the sub-contracted firm(s) CVs and references will be receivable and evaluated under the RFP's Functionality criteria ?
**Response:** This is correct

The contract duration indicated on page 33 of the RFP is 10 months whereas page 35 indicates 18 months maximum timeframe. Please confirm both the contract duration and implementation period for the assignment
**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.

The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

An 18 month total duration for Stages 1 and 2 is indicated on page 32 of the RFP. Please can you confirm that the Consultant's technical and financial proposals must cover all three Stages 1, 2 and 3.

**Response:**

- All three stages must be included in the proposals and submissions
- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.

  The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

It is mentioned that the National Treasury's GCC applies for this tender. Please can you make available both the GCC and SCC for this tender.

**Response:**
https://www.treasury.gov.za/divisions/ocpo/sc/generalconditions/general%20conditions%20of%20contract.pdf
https://www.treasury.gov.za/divisions/ocpo/ostb/1%20RT233-2023%20Special%20Conditions%20of%20Contract.pdf

What supporting documents if any are required to be submitted to evaluate the candidates' references ?

**Response:** Letters of Reference

Please confirm that candidatures for international experts whose qualifications and registrations are pending SAQA accreditation at the time of bid submission will still be receivable ?

**Response:** This is acceptable but to be noted that the results of the SAQA accreditation must be available at the time of award of the tender

Please confirm that the Transaction Advisor retains autonomy over its project team members that will attend meetings with the Project Owner and WPO as appropriate.

**Response:** Transaction Advisor retains autonomy over its project team members

Please can the bidder request a copy of Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study: Wastewater Reclamation Programme November 2017– Prepared by Wayo Consulting during bid preparation ?

**Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

Please confirm approval times for deliverables.

**Response:** 22 working days after receipt

The project steering meetings indicated on page 32 of the RFP are on a quarterly basis with Project Owner and WPO whereas page page 35 indicates a maximum of 36 PSC. Please confirm the frequency, type (online or in-person) and attendance of project steering meetings.
**Response:** Minimum once per monthly Steering Committee Meeting and hybrid meeting can be constituted.

Please confirm what is the role of the Project Owner with respect to making available to the Transaction Advisor all requested data as per the Information Matrix prepared and submitted by the Transaction Advisor at the start of the assignment.
**Response:** The Project Owner will provide all requested data as per the Information Matrix

Please confirm whether the Transaction Advisor will be expected to travel to monthly progress meetings with the Project Officer or whether these meetings will be held online.
**Response:** Hybrid meetings can be accommodated, but cannot be exclusively online. Physical meeting will also be required.

Please confirm what transition periods if any should be accounted for between Stages 1, 2 and 3 of the Transaction Advisor's scope of works.
**Response:** No transition periods should be accounted for between Stages 1, 2 and 3.

For the evaluation criteria of the Project Manager / Team Leader the required years' "post-professional registration experience" is deemed to be unnecessarily high and restrictive. It is requested that the required years' experience is either lowered or changed to "post-graduation experience".
**Response:** The requirements are as per the amended evaluation criteria as issued

Please confirm that for the Environmental Management and Development / Social Facilitation / gender Expert multiple CV's can be submitted, as it may not be possible to find one person that specialises in environmental management, social facilitation and gender assessments.
**Response:** This is acceptable

The Functionality criteria indicates that all the tenderer's experience in PPP bankable feasibility studies must be in water and wastewater sectors which is difficult to meet as not many PPPs have been undertaken in these sectors. Please confirm whether PPP bankable feasibility studies in other sectors could also be receivable.
**Response:** Refer to the amended evaluation criteria

The Functionality criteria related to the tenderer's experience refers to a "combined capital value of projects". Please confirm that the capital value of each project refers to the investment cost of the project (works value) and not the service contract value.
**Response:** The capital value of each project refers to the investment cost of the project and not the professional services (fees) contract value.

Please confirm our understanding that to gain full marks for Support Team (2.5pts) we need to provide 4 CVs for each of the four disciplines Engineering, Finance, CBA and Legal (so 16 CVs in total for Support team).
**Response:** At least 4 resources in each of the four disciplines noted must be provided. Additional support team members in the other disciplines can be provided to demonstrate capacity of the TA to deliver

Please can you provide information on the existing wastewater treatment processes at Each of the sites a.High-level PFD / description, and b.Historical performance / analyses of the Feed Water and Final Effluent to assess performance.
**Response:** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission. Additional information and reports will be made available to the successful bidder

Please can you advise the intended Reuse of the Water ? – we understand that the water should meet SANS 241 (and consider the latest draft standard)-Is the water intended for Industrial reuse, or is it intended that the water will be delivered into Potable water reservoirs.
**Response:** The Transaction Adviser will determine the most beneficial use of the reuse water and potential off-takers and prepare the project accordingly.

Please can you indicate whether any sampling of the water from the existing plants considered Organic contaminants, Emerging chemicals of concern, pharmaceuticals, PFAS etc ? Has any sampling / study been performed to identify source of such organics and chemicals in the supply system to the works ? Or, do they expect the contractor to include sampling and analyses and such studies ?
Response: The contractor to include sampling and analyses

---

**SET QUESTION – FROM M**

Resource (1) and (2) share the same qualification, Can the same cv be used for both roles?
**Response:** The Tenderer must demonstrate it has relevant and sufficient capacity to complete the assignment. It is indicated in the RFP document that bidders may propose a specialist to perform more than one role but a minimum of 7 key resources will be required

Resource (1) can the qualification be that of Finance/ Electrical/Mechanical with experience in TA or Water & Wastewater?
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

Resource (2) Engineer: Can the engineer be either Chemical / Mechanical Engineer with experience in water and wastewater? seeing that the lead is required to be civil? and the work is mostly done by chemical/ mechanical engineers
**Response:** Refer to the amended Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria 2: There is no score for 17.5 on the matrix i.e. Satisfactory starts at 24.5 score
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria 3: minimum score is 28 whilst the sum of minimum score is 27.5. will this figure be rounded off to 28?
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria 4 is missing will we receive a submission template or only the link to submit?
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

Are all Consortium companies including the Lead company required to have individually attended the briefing session?
**Response:** The Lead Tendered is required to have attended the briefing session

Are all consortium companies each required to submit the MD forms and tax certificates or only the Lead is required?
**Response:** All the companies forming part of the consortium or joint venture must submit their credentials and documentation required

Will the successful TA company (ies) be eligible to participate in the second phase of project implementation post conclusion of this project?
**Response:** No

Is there a possibility to extend the submission date seeing we still need to receive the Addendum?
**Response:** Refer to the addendum issued

---

**SET QUESTION – FROM N**

When will the EIDP Feasibility Study referenced in the tender documentation be made available to bidders? **Context:** The Scope of Work identifies the "Ekurhuleni Infrastructure Delivery Programme (EIDP) Feasibility Study – Wayo Consulting (2017)" as a reference document to be consulted to avoid duplication of effort.
**Response::** The 2017 study report is made available for bidders before submission

When will the detailed payment schedule returnable, as discussed during the compulsory briefing session, be provided to bidders? **Context:** During the briefing session DBSA noted that a payment schedule returnable would be issued to bidders.
**Response:** The guideline pricing schedule is issued with the addendum

Will the DBSA include a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) stage in the tender process? **Context:** The RFP does not explicitly indicate whether a BAFO stage will be applied.
**Response:** It is uncertain whether reference is made to this procurement stage (current RFP)? A BAFO will not form part of this current procurement stage but may form part of the procurement for implementation

**SET QUESTION – FROM O**

After reviewing the RFP and annexures in detail, we have realised the level of complexity involved in preparing a comprehensive and professional submission. We kindly request that you seriously consider granting an extension of the deadline to 12 December 2025.
**Response:** Refer to the addendum issued

Could the meeting attendance register be made available, so that we can confirm who has attended the briefing session?
**Response:** The attendance register will not be made available.

Please could a copy of the presentation slides of the briefing session be made available?
**Response:** A copy of the presentation will be provided

In the presentation, a table was presented (screenshot below). Is there a prescribed format in which you wish us to present our financial tender? If so, please provide guidelines
**Response:** The prescribed format spreadsheet will be provided

The RFP Item 26: Evaluation Process refers. Specifically, the table referring to the tenderer's Proposed Key Resources / Experts: It often refers to the "years of post-registration experience" required. Some specialist staff doesn't have to register in their respective fields, and we are challenged in applying this requirement. We kindly request that you change the requirement to the number of years after first degree / qualification.
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

Although the budget was discussed in the briefing session, and no indication was given in relation to any financial matters (budgets, etc.), we do ask you to please give us an indication of your capex estimate.
**Response:** No financial matters will be made available

With respect to the table titled "Evaluation of Experience of the Tenderer's Proposed Key Resources / Experts", in the RFP it states the following for the Environmental Management and Development/Social Facilitator/Gender Expert in terms of experience:

- Poor: Less than 10 years post-registration experience: 1.0 points
- Good: 10 years or more, but less than 15 years post-registration experience: 2.00 points.
- Very Good: 15 years

**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

The registration body cited in the tender documents is EAPASA. EAPASA registration only became a legal requirement from February 2020, so it is not possible to have 15 years post-registration experience. At best, any registered EAP will be evaluated as poor since no-one can have more than 5 years post-registration experience. This is problematic and will affect the functionality score. Kindly revise accordingly.
**Response:** Refer to amended Evaluation Criteria

The ESIA SoW includes reference of a Coastal Waters Discharge Permit. Please confirm that this is not a requirement since this project is not a coastal project and water will not be discharged to into coastal waters.
**Response:** Coastal Waters Discharge Permit is not required

The ESIA SoW, Task 4, Activity 10 states all EISA/WULA/Town Planning documentation must be submitted to the relevant authorities. No town planning assessment or SPLUMA rezoning application is included in the SoW. Must this be included in the SOW?
**Response:** It is not foreseen at this stage that town planning assessment or SPLUMA rezoning will be required

---

**SET QUESTION – FROM O**

No. 1. Clarification on Scoring Criteria for Experience - Please provide us with clarity regarding the scoring criteria for experience, particularly the allocation of points based on the capital values of past projects. Confirm our understanding that at least one project in excess of ZAR 2 billion, or the sum of many projects totalling in excess of ZAR 2 billion, is required to secure maximum points (35 points). - Additionally, we have picked up a potential discrepancy in the scoring columns. Please note that Evaluation of Experience / Track Record of the Tenderer (Lead Tenderer and Entities in JV, Consortium, Association, etc.) in executing work of a similar nature may have been intended to align with the maximum of 25 points.
**Response A:** One or the sum of multiple projects will be considered.
**Response B:** Refer to the amended Evaluation Criteria

No. 2 Support team - Provide CVs of support team to work with key resources in the different fields. - Must bidders submit at least four proposed resources per field?
**Response:** In the key fields as indicated in the evaluation criteria. Additional resources to be provided in the other disciplines to demonstrate capacity to execute the work

No.3 What is the project timeline for the bid, considering the conflicting information about the contract period? - RFP075/2025 - Page 34 of 74 reflects 8 and 10 months. - RFP076/2025 - Page 21 of 73 reflects 18 months
**Response:**

- Stages 1, 2 and 3 must be completed within a maximum timeframe of 18 calendar months.
- ToR looking for a faster pace. Bidders are encouraged to submit shorter estimated timelines, which will be viewed favourably.
  The total contract duration is 18 months from acceptance of the letter of award by the preferred bidder

No 4: In the presentation, a table was presented (screenshot below). Is there a prescribed format in which you wish us to present our financial tender? If so, please provide guidelines.
**Response:** Prescribed format is made available.

No. 5 Legal, Regulatory Compliance (with BEE) and PPP Expert - What specific experience and qualifications are required for the legal compliance and PPP experience role?
**Response:** The Tenderer must demonstrate the legal specialist has requisite qualifications and experience in PPP projects as is indicated in the evaluation criteria

No.6. Pricing Proposal-Advisor Fee Scale - Is there a standard pricing template we can use to prepare our pricing? What is the level of pricing detail that is required by DBSA?
**Response:** A pricing guideline is provided