DBSA

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
1.	Annexure numbering The evaluation tables and CV instructions refer to the CV template and the projects template as being in 'Annexure B', while the Part C list of returnables identifies Annexure B as the SBD4 Declaration of Interest. Please confirm which annexure contains the CV and project templates and confirm the correct annexure lettering for the returnable schedules.	We acknowledge that there is an error in the annexure references within the tender document. Bidders will therefore not be disqualified on the basis of this error, provided that all required returnable schedules, templates, and supporting documents are duly completed and submitted with their bids.
2.	Bid number The tender is cited as RFP0115/2026 on the cover and RFP115/2026 in the Part A invitation and on the briefing slides. Please confirm the number to be quoted on submissions and correspondence.	RFP115/2026
3.	The ToR requires a review and update of existing studies including the prefeasibility study, business case, technical and environmental studies, base-case financial model, demand studies and masterplans, but the briefing confirmed these will only be shared with the preferred bidder. Please confirm whether a document register, index, or summary of the status, date and completeness of each existing study can be released to bidders before submission.	The existing studies are considered sufficiently complete to form the baseline for the assignment. The Transaction Advisor will be required to review these studies, identify gaps and update those elements necessary to support the RFP, and transaction implementation. The principal updates are expected to include:

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
		the demand study; capital-cost estimates/BOQ; legal and regulatory feasibility; risk allocation and detailed risk register; approvals and licensing requirements; and consolidation of the information into the Project Information Memorandum. The existing environmental and technical study, business case and transaction structuring (2025) must be reviewed to identify gaps, additional investigations and licences or authorisations required before appointment or mobilisation of the private partner. The TA will consolidate all studies into a Project information Memorandum (PIM).
4.	Please confirm whether a bill of quantities exists for the RBDBT, its date and level of development, and whether the Transaction Advisor is expected to develop it from first principles or to review and update existing work.	An existing cost estimate/BOQ was developed during project preparation. The Transaction Advisor is required to review it, validate its assumptions, identify fatal flaws and update it to an appropriate 2026 price base. The assignment does not require the Transaction Advisor to develop a measured construction BOQ from first principles as this will be used as a reference design as bidders for the terminal needs to bring in innovation

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
5.	Given that the award is on a fixed price for three years with no escalation, and that commercial and financial close support is by nature open-ended, please confirm whether a change control or scope variation mechanism will be available where the transaction timetable extends beyond the appointment period, and how activities beyond the three years would be dealt with.	The project is urgent and it is anticipated that it will reach preferred bidder within the 3-year period. Additionally, the private partner RFP will be issued to pre-qualified bidders only which will likely shorten the commercial and financial close activities. Should the TA support be required beyond the 3 years, the support may be treated as variation using the base rates provided in this Bid to take into account escalation in line with CPI
6.	Functional criterion 5.2 describes evidence of 'projects executed by the Project Lead/Director', which appears to repeat the wording of criterion 1.2. Please confirm that criterion 5.2 is assessed on projects executed by the nominated Legal and Regulatory Expert.	The Project Lead / Director is a different resource from Legal and Regulatory Expert. 5.2 should read Legal and regulatory Expert in line with the heading
7.	The 0-point band for criterion 5.1 reads 'less than years' experience' and appears to be incomplete. Please confirm the intended lower threshold.	It is meant to be 0 points for less than 7 years
8.	Criterion 6.1 awards 2 points for 10 to 15 years and 0 points for less than 4 years, leaving no band for 4 to 10 years, while the eligibility requirement is at least 10 years post-registration. Please confirm the scoring for a candidate with between 4 and 10 years post-registration experience.	It is meant to be 0 points for less than 10 years
9.	Is this a desktop review and update, or must we undertake new fieldwork, specialist studies and authorisation applications? •What existing ESG reports, authorisations, monitoring data and stakeholder records will be made available (Document Register)? •What is the confirmed project footprint?	The assignment primarily requires a review and gap analysis of the existing environmental work, supported by a site visit and review of available authorisations, compliance information, stakeholder records and operational conditions.

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
		The appointed Transaction Advisor must: review the existing environmental assessments; verify existing licenses, permits and authorizations; identify compliance and authorisation gaps; assess whether additional specialist studies or field investigations are required; prepare an environmental approvals roadmap and risk register; and provide appropriate ESG and environmental requirements for inclusion in the PSP RFP and transaction documents. From a social perspective the Cost Benefit Analysis that will be done should include the social perspective
10.	The component allocations listed under the methodology criterion (10 + 5 + 2 + 5 + 4 + 4) sum to 30, while the stated maximum for the criterion is 28 points. Please confirm the intended allocation, and whether the methodology is scored holistically against the Excellent / Good / Average bands or by aggregating the component marks.	There is an error, the first criteria should be 8 instead of 10.
	Several criteria count only projects over R500m that have reached financial close. Please confirm the form of evidence required to demonstrate financial close - for example a client	In the absence of financial close confirmation then, the completion certification from the Project Owner will suffice

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
	reference letter, a completion certificate, or a signed financing agreement date.	
	Please confirm that for functional criterion 8 the five projects may be aggregated across consortium members and subcontractors, and whether a project delivered by a subcontracted firm counts toward the bidder's profile.	Each project must at least be R500m meaning 5 projects of at least R500m value. The project must have been done by the lead firm in this BID or partner or subcontractor
	Please confirm that a lead expert employed by a subcontractor rather than by a consortium member satisfies the eligibility criteria, provided the qualification and registration requirements are met.	The lead can be any resource as long as they have the requisite expertise and they form part of the Bidders team
	Please confirm the treatment of B-BBEE status for an unincorporated consortium at Stage 4 - whether a consolidated consortium verification certificate is required, or whether the lead entity's certificate applies.	A consolidated consortium verification certificate is required
	Please confirm whether the fixed price is to be presented as a single lump sum for the full scope or broken down by deliverable as set out in Table 1, and whether disbursements are to be priced or provided as a capped allowance.	Pricing should be done as per table 1 schedule. Award based on lump sum. Deliverables and disbursements must be priced in line with Table 1
	For 1) Standard conditions of tender as required, and 2) Returnable documents completed and signed a Clarifictaion Time of "48 hours" is required. This might however be the 48 hours after Friday afternoon 5PM, ending on Sunday 5PM. It might also be that a public holiday is in between. For reasons of practivality, please allow us 2 working days to respond.	The response period is 48 hours, exclusive of weekends and public holidays.
	Seventy points for the technical proposal have to be obtained as a threshold. However, for each individual issue a minimal point value is provided. Do we understand it correctly that actually for each issue the minimu points shoudl be achieved leading to the conclusion that is actually not 1 requirement (the 70 points minimum) but 14 minimum point requirements that have to be achieved?	Minimum points for each evaluation criteria must be obtained and the threshold of 70 points to be evaluated for Stage 4

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
	One of the best project directors for the assignment with 30 years of experience in port bulk terminals PPP deals and rail PPP deals had studied economy, which appear in the list with disciplines. Can "economy" be added to this list of eligible disciplines for the Project Director / Project lead?	No. Bidders are required to respond in line with the listed qualifications requirements.
	We are currenlty having an extensive amount of proposals to hand in. Would it be possible to postpone the deadline by at least 2 weeks also with regards to the high requirements for the proposal?	The closing data is extended to 12 August 2026. (Please see addendum 01)
	Please indicate what the proposed budget is.	Public entities are not permitted to disclose the budget allocated for projects during the procurement process. This is to ensure fairness, transparency, and equal treatment of all bidders, in line with applicable procurement principles and governance requirements.
	In the Detailed scope of service, in Table 1 under item 1 is mentioned: "Review existing reports up to feasibility study (not exhaustive)" Is the list not exhaustive or should the review not be exhaustive? To better estimate the total workload, please provide the full list of documents.	The list is not exhaustive. The list provides minimum critical documents to be reviewed by the TA. Review is expected project specific in line with the scope including lessons learned from similar transactions
	Under item 4 "Transaction Structuring Memorandum and Legal Opinion" it is mentioned that the "legal expert" should provide all items. Quite some items in this list are often not thge expertise of a legal advisor, e.g. optimal PSP models, inyternational comparisons, structural options for ringfencing / JV etc, equity participation, bankability, operational interdependencies, financing, etc. We recognize there is a large legal component, but what legally has to be structured is the result of negotiations and market assessment. Is it possible to put the responsibility of this REF 4 not in the hand of the legal expert?	The project is expected to conducted in an integrated manner i.e. some deliverables require the entire team while others may require 1 or 2 experts.

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
	The Appointment Timelines section requires delivery within thirty-six (36) months, while Preambles to Schedule of Quantities (ii) states the work should be completed within six (6) months. As the bid is a fixed lump sum for three years with no escalation, please confirm which period governs for pricing, and the assumed level of effort for the technical workstream over that period.	6 months is an error. The TA will be appointed for 36 months (3 years) as per the award and pricing conditions.
	Deliverable 15 is titled 'Technical Report (inc. development of the risk register, BOQ)' but the BOQ is not described in the scope text. Please confirm whether the required output is (a) a measured bill of quantities, (b) a capex cost estimate to inform the financial model and BFI submission, or (c) a schedule of works for inclusion in the PSP RFP. If a capex estimate, please confirm the required estimating accuracy class and whether it must cover marine and landlord infrastructure in addition to terminal assets. What are the boundaries of the BOQ and what is the BOQ covering?.	"An existing cost estimate/BOQ was developed during project preparation. The Transaction Advisor is required to review it, validate its assumptions and update it to an appropriate 2026 price base. The assignment does not require the Transaction Advisor to develop a measured construction BOQ from first principles as this will be used as a reference design as bidders for the terminal needs to bring in innovation"
	Deliverable 15 refers to quay wall, port depth, breakwaters and navigation aids, which are TNPA landlord assets rather than terminal assets. Please confirm whether the technical assessment extends to TNPA marine infrastructure, whether TNPA will be represented on the Project Steering Committee, and whether TNPA data and approvals will be made available to the Transaction Advisor.	TNPA is part of Transnet. Integration and alignment and the boundaries of the project which integrates with TNPA and TRIM are key. However, the assets of TNPA and TRIM are not part of the terminal. All supporting documents will be provided to the preferred bidder.
	Please confirm what technical documentation exists from Stages 1 and 2, including drawings, bathymetric survey, geotechnical data, met-ocean data, and any structural or condition assessment of the quay wall and terminal rail, and whether an index of this material can be released to bidders before award. Bidders are currently required to price a fixed lump sum for the review of documentation they have not seen.	The existing studies are considered sufficiently complete to form the baseline for the assignment. The Transaction Advisor will be required to review these studies, identify gaps and update those elements necessary to support the RFP, and transaction implementation.

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
		The principal updates are expected to include: the demand study; capital-cost estimates/BOQ; legal and regulatory feasibility; risk allocation and detailed risk register; approvals and licensing requirements; and consolidation of the information into the Project Information Memorandum. The existing environmental and technical study, business case and transaction structuring (2025) must be reviewed to identify gaps, additional investigations and licences or authorisations required before appointment or mobilisation of the private partner. The TA will consolidate all studies into a Project information Memorandum (PIM).
	Please confirm whether physical investigations (condition surveys, geotechnical investigation, bathymetric or topographical survey) are included in the lump sum, or excluded and to be instructed under the 15% contingency. Please also confirm whether site access for inspection is available to bidders during the tender period.	No designs are expected. Review existing designs and it will be used for reference designs only for the RFP. Designs will be done by the private partner and incorporate innovation
	Please clarify whether the reference to 'track deficiencies' is limited to terminal rail infrastructure (tipplers, sidings, in-terminal track) or extends to the TNPA Bayvue Rail Yard, TFR/TRIM link line and corridor capacity, and how this interfaces with the separate rail PSP transactions.	It refers to the terminal rail infrastructure (tipplers, sidings, in-terminal track). Part of the project design is that an additional tippler is installed for example. The TNPA Bay Rail Yard upgrade will be done by TNPA. The

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
		purpose is to identify capacity, performance and interface constraints affecting RBDBT. It does not require the Transaction Advisor to duplicate the separate rail PSP transactions or undertake detailed corridor engineering design. The advisor must identify dependencies, responsible entities, timing, interface agreements and risks to RBDBT throughput.
	Please confirm the required level of technical output for 'propose a solution to address the possible track deficiencies and design issues': a desk review and gap analysis with an output specification / employer's requirements for the PSP RFP, or concept or preliminary design.	No design is required. A review of the current designs is needed and prices updated, to identify if there is any fatal flaws, allocate risks and identify additional investigations and approvals that could be needed. This will be used merely as a reference design in the RFP. Bidders to the terminal are required to make their own designs and incorporate innovation. They can use the reference design as they wish or not.
	Please confirm whether 'potential capacity development programs needed during the construction phase and operations phase' refers to physical throughput capacity expansion or to institutional and skills capacity building within Transnet.	No design is required. A review of the current designs is needed and prices updated, to identify if there are any fatal flaws, allocate risks and identify additional investigations and approvals that could be needed. This will be used merely as a reference design in the RFP. Bidders to the terminal are required to make their own designs and incorporate innovation. They can use the reference design as they wish or not.

Item no.	RFP115/2026 Question / Enquiry / Query	Response
	Please confirm the intended meaning of 'Shipyard' in Deliverable 15.	"Shipyard" is a drafting error. It should refer to the terminal stockyard/yard and the associated ship-loading interface and equipment.
	Deliverable 15 refers to reviewing 'the RFP documents for the rehabilitation of the Port'. Please confirm whether this is a separate rehabilitation works procurement, and if so its scope, value and programme, or whether it refers to the PSP RFP prepared under Deliverable 8.	It is the same project and inputs for PSP RFP
	Deliverable 15 refers to reviewing 'the RFP documents for the rehabilitation of the Port'. Please confirm whether this is a separate rehabilitation works procurement, and if so its scope, value and programme, or whether it refers to the PSP RFP prepared under Deliverable 8.	It is the same project and inputs for PSP RFP
	Conditions of Award (vii) disqualifies the Transaction Advisor and its affiliates from providing goods, works or services to any bidding consortium, the private party, or any eventual project resulting directly or indirectly from these services. Please confirm the intended duration and scope of this restriction, and whether it extends to unrelated engagements with the same counterparties or at the same port.	Specific to this Bid. The subcontractor can only be part of 1 consortium or the bidder cannot be in multiple consortiums / JV's
	Will the experience of proposed sub-consultants be considered for evaluation purposes, provided they are included as part of the proposed project team?	The identified resource or subcontractor must be provided on the expert team to be evaluated.
	The prescribed CV template provides space for five key projects. Should a resource have additional relevant project experience that strengthens compliance with the evaluation criteria, may we expand the template to include more than five projects?	Although not mandatory, the Bidder may provide a list of all relevant projects in line with the requirements
	Under item 11 "Project participation and Governance support" ongoing legal support is required for meetings. For some topics also technical expert might be necessary. Can also the technical expertise and other expertise necessary for these meetings be included?	Yes. Although item 11 is headed as ongoing legal and governance support, relevant technical, financial, ESG, commercial or other specialists may attend meetings where their expertise is reasonably required.