

DATE: 21 November 2025 Enquiries: Asakundwi Nenguda

Email: Asakundwiscm@dbsa.org Tel: 011 313 3734

Tender Numbers: RFP076/2025

Appointment of Transaction Advisors to Undertake Bankable Feasibility Studies for the Waterval Wastewater Treatment Works ("WWTW") reuse project.

ADDENDUM NO.1

AMENDMENTS TO THE RFP DOCUMENT ON CLOSING DATE, SECTION 25 AND 26 (BID ACCEPTANCE & FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA)

THESE AMENDMENTS MUST BE READ TO FORM PART OF TENDER NO. RFP076/2025

The Tender document issued on e-tender portal and DBSA website on the 21 of October 2025 has the following amendments/additions.

The tender document issued included the following information on closing date, section 25&26. This addendum 01 therefore provides additional information in yellow that supersedes initially provided information to those mentioned areas in the tender document.

NB: Amendments/ addition made are only in yellow and the rest of the information remain the same as the original tender document. It is the responsibility of the bidder to ensure that they compare and assess these changes in conjunction with the original tender document.

- 1. CLOSING DATE: extension of RFP closing date from 05 DECEMBER 2025 to 12 DECEMBER 2025 @23:55.
- 2. BID ACCEPTANCE

All Bids received must remain open for acceptance for a minimum period of 120 (hundred and twenty) 90 (Ninety) days from the Closing Date Time. This period may be extended by written mutual agreement between the DBSA and the Bidder.

3. STAGE 2 (FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION)



Evaluation of Proposed Methodology and Approach: Max points = 30 points.

Prompt(s) For Judgement: Proposed Methodology	Rating (Score) /Points
and Approach No response. Failed to address the question / issue	Disclaimer / No Score: 0 points, Score = 0% of max no. of points for criterion
The technical approach and / or methodology is poor / is unlikely to satisfy project objectives or requirements. The Tenderer has misunderstood certain aspects of the scope of work and does not deal with the critical aspects of the project. Tenderer's proposed methodology and approach inadequately covered less than 3 out of the 7 critical aspects of project methodology and approach. The bidder's project programme is unrealistic, does not correlate with the approach and methodology and does not meet the stated timelines for execution of the work.	Poor: 9 points, (Score = 30% of max no. of points for criterion)
The approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology. The approach does not adequately deal with the critical characteristics of the project. The quality plan, manner in which risk is to be managed etc., is too generic. Tenderer's methodology inadequately covered up to 5 of the 7 critical aspects of project methodology and approach. The bidder's project programme is unrealistic, does not correlate with the approach and methodology and does not meet the stated timelines for execution of the work.	Unsatisfactory/inadequate: 15 points, (Score =50% of max no. of points for criterion)
The approach is specifically tailored to address the specific project objectives and methodology and is sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes that may occur during execution. The quality plan and approach to managing risk etc. is specifically tailored to the critical characteristics of the project. Tender's methodology acceptably covered up to 6 of the 7 critical aspects of project methodology and approach. The bidder's project programme is realistic, correlates with the approach and methodology and meets the stated timelines for execution of the work	Good/satisfactory: 21 points (Score =70% of max no. of points for criterion)
Besides meeting the "good" rating, the important issues are approached in an innovative and efficient way, indicating that the Tenderer has outstanding knowledge of state-of-the- art approaches. The approach paper details ways to improve the project outcomes and the quality of the outputs. Tenderer's methodology acceptably covered all the 7	Very good: 30 points (Score =100% of max no. of points for criterion)

critical aspects of project methodology and approach. The bidder's project programme is realistic, correlates with the approach and methodology and substantially meets or exceeds the stated timelines for execution of the work

Note: Methodology must cover at minimum: 1. Needs Analysis; 2. Solution Options Analysis: 3. Project Due Diligence; 4. Value Assessment (Financial Model); 5. Economic Valuation (CBA); 6. Procurement Plan; 7. Bankable Feasibility Study Report & Revisiting the Feasibility Study.

A detailed project implementation plan / programme is required to illustrate activities that will be performed and estimated timelines to meet the stated project execution timeline of not more than 18 months.

Evaluation of Experience / Track Record of the Tenderer (Lead Tenderer and Entities in JV, Consortium, Association, etc.) in executing work of a similar nature: Max points = 25 points.

Prompt(s) For Judgement: Experience of the	Rating (Score) /Points
Tenderer	
Tenderer has submitted no information or inadequate	Disclaimer / No Score: 0 points. Score = 0% of
information to determine scoring level.	max no. of points for criterion
Tenderer has successfully provided professional services	Poor: 44 10 points. (Score = 40% of max no. of
in the development of PPP bankable feasibility studies,	points for criterion)
cost-benefit analysis (CBA), financial modelling, project	·
preparation, and procurement documents for PPP/project	
finance projects and/or waste water treatment or water	
reuse projects contracts in South Africa or internationally,	
with the projects having a combined capital value of less	
than R500 million in the past 15 years.	
Tenderer has successfully provided professional services	Satisfactory: 24.5 17.5 points. (Score =70% of
in the development of PPP bankable feasibility studies,	max no. of points for criterion)
cost-benefit analysis (CBA), financial modelling, project	
preparation, and procurement documents for PPP/project	
finance projects and/or waste water treatment or water	
reuse projects contracts in South Africa or internationally,	
with the projects having a combined capital value of	
between R500 million and R1 000m in the past 15 years.	
Tenderer has successfully provided professional services	Good: 31.5 22.5 points. (Score =90% of max no.
in the development of PPP bankable feasibility studies,	of points for criterion)
cost-benefit analysis (CBA), financial modelling, project	
preparation, and procurement documents for PPP/project	
finance projects and/or waste water treatment or water	
reuse projects contracts in South Africa or internationally,	
with the projects having a combined capital value of	
between R1 000 million and R2 000m in the past 15	
years.	
Tenderer has successfully provided professional services	Very good: 35 25 points. (Score =100% of max
in the development of PPP bankable feasibility studies,	no. of points for criterion)

cost-benefit analysis (CBA), financial modelling, project preparation, and procurement documents for PPP/project finance projects and/or waste water treatment or water reuse projects contracts in South Africa or internationally, with the projects having a combined capital value of more than R2 000 million in the past 15 years.

Evaluation of Experience of the Tenderer's Proposed Key Resources / Experts: Max points = 40 points.

ID	Key Resource / Expert	Maximum No of Points	Prompt(s) For Judgement: Experience of The Tenderer's Proposed Key Resources / Experts and Rating Score /Points
1	Project Manager/ Team Leader	10	 Submit a CV, qualification in Civil Engineering or Finance (min of NQF level 8 in a relevant field) and relevant professional registration with ECSA. Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points Poor: Less than 20 years post-professional registration experience: 4.0 points Good 20 years or more, but less than 25 years post-professional registration experience: 7 points. Very Good: 25 years or more post-professional registration experience: 10 points.
2	Engineer: waste water treatment / Water Reuse specialist	7.5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 8 in Civil engineering or chemical process engineering) and professional registration with ECSA Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points Poor: Less than 15 years post-professional registration experience: 2 points Good: 15 years or more, but less than 20 years post-professional registration experience: 3.5 points. Very Good: 20 years or more post-professional registration experience: 5 7.5 points.
3	Legal, Regulatory Compliance (with BEE) and PPP Expert	5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 8 in law) and professional registration with LPC Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points Poor: Less than 15 years post-registration experience: 2 points Good: 15 years or more, but less than 20 years post-registration experience: 3.5 points. Very Good: 20 years or more post-registration experience: 5 points.
4	Risk Management Specialist	2.5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 7) Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points Poor: Less than 15 years post-registration experience: 1.0 points Good: 15 years or more, but less than 20 years post-registration experience: 2.00 points. Very Good: 20 years or more post-registration experience: 2.5 points.
5	Municipal Finance / Infrastructure Investment Analysis and Project Finance / financial modelling Expert	5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 8 in finance) and professional registration with a relevant professional body. Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points Poor: Less than 15 years post-registration experience: 2 points Good: 15 years or more, but less than 20 years post-registration experience: 3.5 points.



			Very Good: 20 years or more post-registration experience: 5 points.
6	Environmental Management and Development / Social Facilitation / gender Expert	2.5	 Submit a CV, relevant qualification (min of NQF level 7) and professional registration with EAPASA. Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points 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 or more post-registration experience: 2.5 points.
7	Cost Benefit Analysis & Socio- Economic Impact Analysis Specialist	2.5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 8 in economics) Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points 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 or more post-registration experience: 2.5 points.
8	Stakeholder Engagement Specialist	2.5	 Submit a CV, qualification (min of NQF level 7) Disclaimer: No information submitted: 0 points 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 or more post-registration experience: 2.5 points.
9	Support team	2.5	 Provide CVs of support team to work with key resources in the different fields. Poor: inadequate support team and resources provided in key field of Engineering, Finance, CBA and Legal (Less than 2 proposed resources per field): 0 points Good: adequate support team and resources provided in key field of Engineering, Finance, CBA and Legal (Between 3-4 proposed resources per field): 2 points Very good: excellent support team and resources provided in key field of Engineering, Finance, CBA and Legal (More than 4 proposed resources per field): 2.5 points.

Note: bidders may propose a specialist to perform more than one role but a minimum of 7 resources will be required

Evaluation of the Lead Tenderer's Quality Management System: Max points = 5 points

Prompt(S) For Judgement: Lead Tenderer's Quality Management System (QMS)	Rating (Score) /Points
<u> </u>	Disclaimer / No Score: 0 points. Score = 0% of max no. of points for criterion



The Lead Tenderer's QMS Policy is elementary or sub-standard and will not	Poor: 2 points. (Score = 40% of max no. of points for criterion)
result in quality work.	
The Lead Tenderer's QMS Policy is good,	Satisfactory: 3.5 points. (Score =70% of max no. of points for
workable, and is likely to result in quality	criterion)
work.	
The Lead Tenderer's QMS Policy is good	Good: 5 points. (Score =100% of max no. of points for
and is likely to result in quality work. Lead	criterion)
Tenderer is also SANS 9000 / ISO 9001 or	
equivalent certified. Proof of the Lead	
Tenderer's SANS 9000 / ISO 9001 or	
equivalent certification is submitted.	

DocuSigned by:

Asakundwi Neuruda

7700A66997BEB476...

Asakundwi Nenguda

Procurement Officer

DocuSigned by:

0B47FD2F386849A

Simon Ludik

Acting Head: SCM Lending



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF ADDENDUM NO.1

AMENDMENT TO THE TENDER DOCUMENT:

THESE CLARIFICATIONS MUST BE READ TO FORM PART OF TENDER NO. RFP076/2025

Acknowledgement of Receipt	
I (Name)	hereby acknowledge the existence of
addendum No 1 of RFP076/2025 on behalf of	
(Company Name)	
Signature.	Date