



Ref: MD12/4/1/ PSTP

Questions received with responses for BID: MT03/2026

	Question	Response
1	Under the Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement stream, "Support industry liaison" appears more than once. The personnel list in section 3.2.1.1 lists "Support industry liaisons x 2", and the scoring table in section 3.2.1.3 separately lists further "Support industry liaison" entries. The additional-specialist points in that table also sum to more than the stated maximum of 20. Please confirm the correct number of support industry liaisons the tender requires two, or four and the correct roles and point allocation that make up the 20-point maximum for additional specialists.	The number of support industry liaisons required is 2 (two). Although the points division may add up to more than 20, the maximum score attainable for that list will be 20.
2	We wish to understand the permitted submission structure. Clause 8.5(6) provides that a bid will not be considered where a bidder has "submitted more than one offer (including participation in joint venture/consortium arrangements with others)". At the same time, clauses 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.3.2 state that tenderers are permitted to tender for multiple technical specialist appointments. Against that, please confirm: a) Whether a single tenderer may submit for more than one Part 2 stream within one bid submission, and whether this is treated as one offer or several for the purposes of clause 8.5(6); and b) Whether related entities may each submit separately for different Part 2 streams without contravening clause 8.5(6) or the exclusivity requirement in clause 2.4.2.	(a) Part 2 contains different areas of work and tenderers may choose to tender for one, or more than one area of work within Part 2. Each area of work will be evaluated separately. (b) Related entities may each submit separately for different Part 2 streams, provided that each submission is made by a separate tenderer with a separate and independent team, and provided that there is no sharing of personnel, specialists, subcontractors, resources or team members between the submissions.
3	We are a Cape Town-based staff transport operator with a fleet of 33 x Toyota Quantum 12-seater vehicles (all under 5 years, roadworthy, PrDP drivers, operating licences) and would like to tender.	All tender documentation, including the detailed scope of services and applicable requirements, has been published on the eTender Portal and should be accessed there. Please obtain and carefully review the complete tender documentation before submitting any further

	Could you please assist with the following details, as the advert summary does not include the full Terms of Reference: Full tender document and pricing schedule (C.4 equivalent) for MT03/2026 Detailed scope — is this for staff shuttle, learner transport, or public transport operations under PSTP? Sites / routes and daily km estimates (pick-up points to workstations) Vehicle requirements — minimum seating capacity, maximum age, branding, and tracking/communication requirements Whether briefing is required and if site inspection is applicable Functionality criteria — age of fleet, experience, local footprint scoring	clarification queries, as bidders are required to study the bid document and technical specifications before seeking clarification. For clarity, this tender is for professional and technical services under the Provincial Sustainable Transport Programme and is not a procurement of transport services. Accordingly, the staff shuttle, learner transport and vehicle-operation requirements referred to in your enquiry are not applicable to the services being procured.
4	1. Combining Part 1 core team and key specialist roles Clause 2.4.1 permits one person to fill more than one core team role, subject to a minimum of six core team members, and permits core team members to fill key specialist positions. Please confirm whether any restrictions apply to particular combinations or to the number of key specialist positions held by one person. In particular, may the Legal and Contractual Lead also fulfil both the Transport Legislation and Public Law Specialist and the Contracts and Procurement Specialist positions, provided that the individual meets each position's requirements? Similarly, may the Legal and Contractual Lead also fulfil the Corporate Governance lead, provided that the individual meets each position's requirements?	Clause 2.4.1 permits one person to fulfil more than one core team role, subject to maintaining a minimum core team of six persons and further permits core team members to fulfil key specialist positions. No additional restrictions are specified regarding particular role combinations or the number of key specialist positions that may be held by a single individual. Accordingly, the Legal and Contractual Lead may also fulfil the Transport Legislation and Public Law Specialist, Contracts and Procurement Specialist and/or Corporate Governance Lead roles, provided that the individual fully satisfies the requirements prescribed for each position and that the tenderer demonstrates sufficient capacity for the individual to perform all assigned roles.
5	2. The "Additional Project Manager" position Notwithstanding the general permission in clause 2.4.1, does the designation "Additional Project Manager" in clause 2.3.2 require a person distinct from the core team Project Manager? Please identify any other positions for which a separate individual is mandatory.	The designation "Additional Project Manager" in clause 2.3.2 does not create an exception to the provisions of clause 2.4.1. Clause 2.4.1 expressly permits a single individual to fulfil more than one role on the core team and further permits core team members to fulfil key specialist positions, subject to the maintenance of a minimum core team comprising six (6) individuals and compliance with the applicable qualification, experience, reference and capacity requirements.
6	3. Capacity requirements where roles are combined Please clarify how the minimum capacity percentages in clause 2.4.1 apply where one person holds multiple core roles. Must the percentages be added, or may an integrated allocation be accepted where responsibilities overlap? For example, would a person nominated as both Legal and Contractual	The minimum capacity percentages stipulated in clause 2.4.1 are intended to ensure that sufficient capacity is available to fulfil the responsibilities of the relevant core team positions. Where a single individual is nominated for multiple core team roles, the tenderer must demonstrate, through the required capacity statement, that the individual has sufficient available capacity to effectively perform all assigned responsibilities.

	Lead and Corporate Governance Lead need to demonstrate 85% availability? Where a core team member also fills key specialist positions, must additional capacity be reserved for those positions, and how should this be reflected in the capacity statement?	
7	4. Measurement and deployment of capacity Please specify the basis on which the minimum capacity percentages will be assessed: weekly or monthly working time, annual availability, or an average over the contract period. How should bidders address fluctuating existing commitments and anticipated peak demands? Please also confirm whether the percentages represent capacity to remain available for instructed work, rather than a guaranteed allocation of billable work, given the rates-only appointment and the statement that pricing quantities are illustrative.	The minimum capacity percentages specified in clause 2.4.1 are intended to demonstrate that suitably qualified resources have sufficient availability to perform the required services under the contract. Capacity will be assessed based on the availability of the proposed resource relative to their disclosed existing commitments, as reflected in the required capacity statement. Tenderers should therefore disclose current commitments, and anticipated resource demands to be able to assess whether sufficient capacity exists to perform the proposed role or roles. Where commitments fluctuate over time, the capacity statement should reflect the tenderer's best assessment of the resource's ongoing availability for the duration of the appointment.
8	5. Evaluation of individuals nominated for multiple positions Where one person fills more than one core position, will that person be evaluated separately against each position's criteria and required to achieve at least 85% for each position? Please explain how the collective 90% core team threshold and the score subsequently converted to 20 points will be calculated where eight positions are filled by six or seven individuals. Similarly, will a core member nominated for key specialist positions be scored separately under each applicable specialist category?	Where a single individual is nominated for more than one core team position, the individual will be evaluated separately against the criteria applicable to each position occupied. The requirement in clause 2.4.1 that "each member of the core team must score at least 85% on evaluation" will therefore apply to each position for which that individual is proposed. The collective core team score will be calculated using the scoring framework applicable to each of the eight prescribed core team positions, irrespective of whether those positions are filled by six, seven or eight individuals. The resulting total score out of the maximum available core team points will then be assessed against the minimum requirements and converted to the score out of 20 points as described in clause 2.4.4.1. Where a core team member is also nominated for one or more key specialist positions, the individual will be evaluated separately against the requirements applicable to each key specialist position claimed. The fact that the same individual occupies a core team position does not remove the requirement to satisfy the relevant key specialist criteria for evaluation purposes.
9	6. References and evidence for combined roles	The same client-completed reference sets may be used to support multiple core team positions

	May the same three client-completed reference sets support multiple core roles, and any relevant key specialist nominations, where the references expressly substantiate the different responsibilities? Alternatively, are separate reference sets required for each nominated position? Please also confirm whether leadership of a defined specialist workstream or assignment within a larger programme satisfies the core team leadership requirement, provided that the client verifies that leadership contribution.	and/or key specialist nominations, provided that the references clearly demonstrate the experience, responsibilities and competencies relevant to each position claimed, and meet all other requirements. The tender documentation does not require separate reference sets for each nominated position. However, tenderers remain responsible for demonstrating that the reference evidence adequately supports the requirements of every role for which the individual is nominated.
10	7. Allocation of overlapping Part 1 responsibilities Clauses 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 contain related responsibilities across the Institutional Lead, Corporate Governance Lead, Legal and Contractual Lead, Organisational Development Specialist and the two legal specialist positions. Please clarify the intended division of responsibility for institutional structuring, company establishment, governance instruments, procurement advice and contract drafting and negotiation. Should bidders propose a responsibility matrix allocating these activities and identifying the accountable lead, or does the Department prescribe a particular allocation? The same clarification is requested for the interface between the Financial and Funding Lead, Financial Structuring and Private Sector Participation Lead, and the related finance specialists	The tender documentation does not prescribe a fixed allocation of responsibilities between the various core team and key specialist positions. Tenderers are expected to propose a team structure and allocation of responsibilities that best demonstrates their ability to deliver the required outcomes across the work areas and key deliverables described in the specification. Accordingly, bidders should clearly identify the lead individual responsible for each major area of work, including where responsibilities may overlap between: The Institutional Lead, Corporate Governance Lead, Legal and Contractual Lead, Organisational Development Specialist, Transport Legislation and Public Law Specialist, and Contracts and Procurement Specialist; and the Financial and Funding Lead, Financial Structuring and Private Sector Participation Lead, and related finance specialists. While a formal responsibility matrix is not a prescribed submission requirement, tenderers may include such information where it assists in demonstrating role clarity, integration and accountability within the proposed team structure.
11	8. Bidding entity participation across Parts 1 and 2 Clause 2.4 prohibits concurrent nomination of the same personnel across Parts 1 and 2. Clause 2.4.2 also states that "Tenderers and team members" may not be on the SBPT and TST appointments concurrently, while clause 3.2 envisages the SBPT as lead contractor supported by nominated TST specialists. a. Please clarify whether one bidding entity may submit for, and be awarded, both Parts using entirely separate personnel, or whether the	An Erratum was issued and this is the updated response that was emailed to all. "A tendering entity may participate in either Part 1 or Part 2, but not both, irrespective of whether entirely separate personnel are proposed. Accordingly, the bidding entity should not submit for both Part 1 and Part 2. This restriction applies to the lead tenderer and to all joint venture consortium members and subcontractors forming part of the tender submissions."

	restriction also applies to the bidding entity itself. Please explain how this applies to joint venture members and subcontracting entities within a combined submission	
12	9. Contractual structure and authority between the SBPT and TST Please confirm whether Part 2 specialists will be subcontractors to the successful Part 1 contractor or appointed directly by the Department under separate contracts or panel appointments. In either case, please clarify responsibility for issuing instructions, approving assignment proposals and budgets, accepting deliverables, paying fees and managing performance. Please also confirm the extent of the SBPT's contractual responsibility for TST deliverables.	Part 1 and Part 2 constitute separate appointments under the tender. A contract will be entered into directly with the successful tenderer(s) for the relevant Part and does not intend that Part 2 appointments automatically function as subcontractors to a Part 1 contractor. Where clause 3.2 refers to the SBPT acting as the lead contractor supported by the TST, this relates to the coordination, integration and management of technical inputs required for delivery of the PSTP and not to a subcontracting relationship prescribed by the tender documentation. The SBPT will be expected to provide programme leadership, coordination and integration of TST activities where required by an assignment. However, the tender documentation does not make the Part 1 contractor contractually liable for the performance or deliverables of separately appointed Part 2 contractors unless such responsibility is expressly established through a specific instruction, assignment or contractual arrangement
13	10. Legal, governance and industry-transition interfaces across Parts Please clarify the intended boundary between Part 1 legal, corporate governance and institutional support and Part 2 industry transition, facilitation and engagement, particularly for: • negotiations between government and the minibus taxi industry; • establishment and governance of industry-owned companies; • preparation and negotiation of agreements; and • organisational development and implementation support. May Part 1 personnel provide their contracted strategic, legal and governance input to an initiative being implemented by the TST without this constituting a prohibited concurrent Part 2 appointment? Please confirm how the Department expects accountability and quality assurance to be allocated.	The documentation recognises that there is interaction between the Part 1 legal, governance and institutional functions and the Part 2 industry transition, facilitation and engagement functions. The distinction is that Part 1 is primarily responsible for strategic, institutional, legal, governance and business planning support, while Part 2 is primarily responsible for facilitation, implementation support, stakeholder engagement and industry transition activities. Accordingly: Negotiations between government and the minibus taxi industry may require contributions from both Parts, with Part 1 providing strategic, legal, contractual and governance support and Part 2 providing facilitation and stakeholder engagement support. Company establishment, governance frameworks, governance instruments, legal agreements, procurement advice and contract drafting are principally Part 1 responsibilities. Industry engagement, transition support, stakeholder facilitation, peacebuilding, organisational change support and

		implementation assistance are principally Part 2 responsibilities. Part 1 personnel may provide strategic, legal, governance and institutional support to initiatives that are being implemented with assistance from the TST. This does not, in itself, constitute a Part 2 appointment, provided the personnel remain appointed and utilised within their Part 1 role and do not form part of the Part 2 personnel proposed for evaluation and appointment. Accountability to reside with the lead resource responsible for the relevant area of work, with overall integration and coordination provided by the SBPT in accordance with the specification. Quality assurance remains the responsibility of the appointed contractor for the services delivered under its appointment.
14	11. Multiple appointments within Part 2 Clauses 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.3.2 permit tenderers to bid for multiple technical specialist or panel appointments. Please clarify whether the same individual may be nominated across more than one Part 2 specialisation, including as Team Lead, provided that the individual meets the respective criteria and demonstrates sufficient capacity. Please distinguish this position from the prohibition on sharing personnel between Parts 1 and 2 and between competing tenders.	The tender documents confirm that the provisions permitting tenderers to bid for multiple Part 2 appointments do not prohibit the nomination of the same individual across multiple Part 2 specialisations. Accordingly, the same individual may be nominated for more than one Part 2 role, provided that the individual satisfies the qualification, experience and other requirements applicable to each position and that sufficient capacity is demonstrated for all proposed responsibilities.
15	12. Location requirements for core members and key specialists Clause 2.4.1 requires core members to be based in the Western Cape, ideally within Cape Town, and allows a maximum of two members outside Cape Town subject to motivation. Please confirm whether that exception is limited to locations elsewhere within the Western Cape, and whether any equivalent residence, office-location or minimum physical-presence requirement applies to Part 1 key specialists or Part 2 personnel. Please distinguish the location requirement at bid submission from attendance and deployment obligations during delivery.	The location requirement in clause 2.4.1 applies only to core team members. The provision allowing a maximum of two core team members to be based outside Cape Town is not limited to locations within the Western Cape, provided that an adequate motivation is submitted and accepted. The tender documentation does not prescribe an equivalent residence, office-location or minimum physical-presence requirement for Part 1 key specialists or Part 2 personnel. The location requirements applicable at tender stage should be distinguished from the operational requirements during contract delivery. Irrespective of where personnel are based, the successful tenderer will be required to ensure that appropriately qualified personnel are available to perform the required services, attend meetings, workshops, engagements and site activities, and otherwise fulfil the obligations of the contract as and when required.
16	13. Repeated Part 2 personnel entries and inconsistent scoring totals	There is an apparent duplication of the "Support Industry Liaison x 2" role within the Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement

	In the Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement specification, "Support industry liaisons x 2" appears on both pages 52 and 53. The evaluation table on pages 55–56 also contains repeated support liaison entries, and the listed maximum row scores total 24 rather than the stated 20. Please confirm the intended number of distinct support liaison resources and issue a corrected personnel and scoring schedule. In addition, the Transport Operations, Monitoring, and Inspection evaluation allocates 15 points to local knowledge and relevant experience in clause 3.2.3.2, whereas the table in clause 3.2.3.6 provides a maximum of 20 points. Please confirm the applicable weighting and any required normalisation.	specification and the corresponding repetition within the evaluation table. For evaluation purposes, the intention is that there are two (2) Support Industry Liaison positions only. The maximum score available for additional specialists under this section remains 20 points, as stated in the specification. Tenderers should therefore submit resources based on: 1 × Experienced Industry Facilitator; 2 × Experienced Industry Liaisons; 2 × Support Industry Liaisons; and 1 × Change Management and Organisational Development Specialist. It is confirmed that the stated maximum score of 20 points for the additional specialists is the applicable score for evaluation purposes. With respect to the Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection section, it is confirmed that the intended weighting is that stated in clause 3.2.3.2, namely: Key Personnel Experience: 40 points; Company Experience: 15 points; Methodology Statement: 30 points; and Local Knowledge and Relevant Experience: 15 points. The table in clause 3.2.3.6 should therefore be read as providing the scoring thresholds for Local Knowledge and Relevant Experience, with the resulting score normalised to the prescribed weighting of 15 points for the overall technical evaluation
17	14. Consistent role titles and returnable references Please confirm that the "Contracts specialist" listed in clause 2.3.2 is the same position described as "Contracts and procurement specialist" in the detailed table, and that the "Strategic transport planning and operations lead" is the same core position evaluated as "Strategic transport planning lead". Schedule A7 also refers to four Part 2 methodology sections, including clause 3.1.4.5, whereas Annexure 1 presents three specialist areas under clauses 3.2.1–3.2.3. Please confirm the required methodology submissions and correct the cross-references.	The "Contracts Specialist" listed in clause 2.3.2 and the "Contracts and Procurement Specialist" described in the detailed table refer to the same key specialist position. Similarly, the "Strategic Transport Planning and Operations Lead" identified in clause 2.3.1 and the "Strategic Transport Planning Lead" used in the evaluation tables refer to the same core team position. With regard to Schedule A7, the reference to a methodology statement under clause 3.1.4.5, tenderers are required to submit methodology statements only for the Part 2 specialist areas described in the specification, namely: Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement; Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design, including Non-Motorised Transport and Universal Accessibility; and Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection.

		The methodology submissions and evaluations will be based on the applicable methodology provisions contained in the respective Part 2 specialist sections of the specification.
18	15. Signing of Part A, project reference template (by Core team or Key specialist member) We refer to the template to be completed by the specific core or key specialist as specified in Schedule A7. Would any electronic signatures be accepted due to proposed staff not being available in country currently? If not, would an Affidavit be accepted?	Electronic signatures will be accepted on the Project Reference Template contained in Schedule A7, provided that the signature can reasonably be attributed to the relevant Core Team Member or Key Specialist and that the authenticity of the declaration and supporting information can be verified if required. An affidavit is not solely required because a proposed team member is located outside the Republic of South Africa at the time of tender submission. An affidavit may be submitted as supplementary evidence, but it is not a substitute for the required declaration contained in the prescribed template. The right reserves to verify any information, declarations, references, signatures or supporting documentation submitted as part of the tender evaluation process.
19	1. Clause 2.4.2 "Exclusivity" of Annexure 1 states "Tenderers and team members may not be on the Strategic Business Planning Team, and the Technical Specialist Team appointments concurrently." We note that the wording of Clause 2.4.2 appears to be the same as that contained in the previous PSTP tender (T004/23), in respect of which a subsequent clarification confirmed that tenderers could submit a bid for either Part 1 (Strategic Business Planning Team) or Part 2 (Technical Specialist Team), but could not tender for both Part 1 and any subsection of Part 2. a) Please confirm whether the same interpretation applies to the present tender, i.e. that a tendering entity may not participate in bids for both Part 1 and Part 2, irrespective of whether separate, non-overlapping personnel are proposed? b) Please confirm whether it applies to all entities and personnel/resources participating in a tender, irrespective of the capacity in which they participate, such that: i. an entity participating in a bid for Part 1 may not also participate in another bid for Part 1 or in a bid for Part 2 (and vice versa), whether as Lead Tenderer, member of a Joint Venture or Consortium, subcontractor, or in any other capacity; and ii. personnel/resources proposed under one bid may not also be proposed under another bid for Part 1 or Part 2, whether as an	(a) Tenderers and team members may not be on the Strategic Business Planning Team (Part 1) and the Technical Specialist Team (Part 2) concurrently. Therefore, tenderers should not submit for both Part 1 and Part 2. Tenderers should choose to tender for either Part 1 or Part 2. Part 2 contains different areas of work and tenderers may choose to tender for one, or more than one area of work within Part 2. Each area of work will be evaluated separately. (b) The exclusivity requirement applies to all entities and personnel forming part of a tender submission. Accordingly: - an entity participating in one tender submission may not participate in another tender submission for Part 1 or Part 2 in any capacity; and - personnel proposed in one tender submission may not be proposed in any other tender submission, irrespective of whether they are employees, independent consultants, subcontracted resources or resources provided through another joint venture or consortium participant. Where an entity or proposed resource appears in more than one tender submission contrary to the exclusivity provisions, all affected tender

	employee, subcontracted resource, independent consultant, or through another member of a Joint Venture or Consortium? c) Please confirm whether a bid will be disqualified where an entity or proposed resource appears in more than one bid contrary to the above requirements?	submissions may be disqualified in accordance with clause 2.4.2.
20	2. Clause 2.4.5 of Annexure 1, Professional Services Specifications (Company Experience), states that company experience "relates to the specific experience of the lead company." Please confirm that, in assessing Company Experience, in the case of a Joint Venture or Consortium, only the experience of the single "lead company" will be assessed, and any assessment of Company Experience will exclude the experience of sub-consultants and non-lead consortium or joint venture members?	For the purposes of clause 2.4.5, Company Experience will be assessed based on the experience of the lead company only. Where a tender is submitted by a Joint Venture or Consortium, the lead company must be clearly identified, and the Company Experience evaluation will be based on that entity's experience. Accordingly, the experience of sub-consultants and non-lead Joint Venture or Consortium members will not be considered for scoring under the Company Experience criterion. Such experience may, however, be relevant where reflected through the qualifications, experience and scoring of the proposed personnel. The Company Experience will be strictly evaluated in accordance with clause 2.4.5, which expressly refers to the experience of the lead company.
21	Reference letter questions 3. Please confirm whether a reference letter using the prescribed template, which evidences a project/assignment that falls within the required 5-year window, will remain valid for evaluation purposes if the letter itself was signed at an earlier date (e.g. approximately 3 years ago), or whether all reference letters must be dated within a specified recent period regardless of when the underlying project took place?	The validity of a reference for evaluation purposes is determined by the timing and relevance of the underlying project or assignment, and not by the date on which the reference letter was signed. Accordingly, a reference letter completed using the prescribed template will be accepted where it relates to a project or assignment that falls within the applicable five-year period specified in the tender documentation, even if the reference letter itself was signed at an earlier date.
22	4. Clause 2.4.9 of Annexure 1 requires a project reference template with "three relevant projects or assignments within the last five years per core team member, or which were underway at the time of tender publication and clause 2.4.1 states that "Each member of the core team must provide 3 references from different projects or assignments". a) Please confirm that where one individual fills more than one core-team position, three references are required for each position for which the individual is put forward, and not just three per core team member?	Where a single individual is nominated for more than one core team position, it requires that the individual satisfy the requirements applicable to each position claimed. Accordingly, sufficient reference evidence must be provided to support each position for which the individual is nominated. The same reference project may be relied upon for multiple positions, provided that the reference demonstrates the relevant experience, responsibilities and leadership requirements applicable to each position. The same referee and project may be used in support of multiple positions, provided that:

	b) Please confirm that the same referee and project can be used demonstrate the nature and quality of work for multiple positions, as long as the different positions are specified and the description of work done covers each different position?	- the project or assignment is relevant to each position claimed; - the role performed by the individual in relation to each position is clearly described; and - the reference adequately demonstrates the nature, quality and scope of the individual's contribution relevant to each position.
23	Price schedule questions 5. Annexure 2 (Price Schedule) is issued as a separate MS Excel spreadsheet comprising Sheet 2 (Part 1 Financial Table) and Sheet 3 (Part 2 Technical Specialist Financial Table). The Key Specialist list under Part 1 includes a "Low Carbon Transition and E-Mobility Specialist", however the pricing categories in the issued Price Schedule do not appear to include a corresponding hourly rate line item for this specialist; instead, there is a "Disaster Risk Management Specialist". Please confirm whether the Disaster Risk Management Specialist category should be removed, and replaced with the Low Carbon Transition and E-Mobility Specialist, or whether an amended pricing schedule will be issued?	The discrepancy between the key specialist list in Annexure 1 and the pricing categories contained in Annexure 2 is noted. The intended specialist position is the Low Carbon Transition and E-Mobility Specialist as described in clause 2.3.2 of the specification. The inclusion of Disaster Risk Management Specialist in the Price Schedule is a typographical error. Accordingly, tenderers should price the Low Carbon Transition and E-Mobility Specialist against the corresponding line item currently reflected as Disaster Risk Management Specialist in Annexure 2. No separate pricing for a Disaster Risk Management Specialist is required for this tender.
24	6. Annexure 2 (Price Schedule) has only one Part 2 Financial Table, but Part 2 comprises multiple specialisation/workstream areas that are evaluated separately. Please confirm that, if it is permissible to bid for more than one of the three workstreams in Part 2, where a tenderer does so, the Part 2 Financial Table should be duplicated and completed separately for each workstream?	A tenderer may submit a bid for more than one of the Part 2 workstreams. Where a tenderer elects to bid for multiple Part 2 workstreams, the Part 2 Financial Table should be completed separately for each workstream to which the tender relates, using the personnel and rates applicable to that workstream. The separate pricing submissions will be used for the evaluation of the respective Part 2 workstreams. Accordingly, tenderers bidding for more than one Part 2 workstream should duplicate the Part 2 Financial Table and submit a completed version for each relevant workstream.
25	7. Annexure 2 (Price Schedule) contains fixed illustrative disbursements of R12 million for Part 1 and R2 million for Part 2. Please confirm whether the illustrative disbursement amounts will be included in comparative price scoring and whether the full Part 2 amount applies irrespective of whether Part 2 is bid for or how many Part 2 appointments a bidder tenders for?	The illustrative disbursement amounts reflected in the Pricing Summary form part of the tender's comparative price calculation and will therefore be included in the evaluation of price. For Part 2, the illustrative disbursement amount is intended to apply to the relevant Part 2 submission being evaluated. Accordingly, where a tenderer submits bids for multiple Part 2 workstreams, the same illustrative disbursement amount should not be multiplied or accumulated across workstreams for evaluation purposes.
26	Scoring questions 8. For "Transport operations, monitoring and inspection," the stated allocation, in	It is confirmed that the intended weighting for the Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection evaluation is as stated in clause 3.2.3.2, namely:

	Annexure 1, clause 3.2.3.2 "Evaluation criteria" is: • Personnel: 40 • Company experience: 15 • Methodology: 30 • Local experience: 15 However, the "Local knowledge and relevant experience" table under clause 3.2.3.6 awards up to 20 points, producing a possible total of 105. Please confirm whether the maximum score for local knowledge and relevant experience under section 3.2.3.6 is 15 or 20 points and provide the corrected scoring table or corrected total?	Key Personnel Experience: 40 points; Company Experience: 15 points; Methodology Statement: 30 points; and Local Knowledge and Relevant Experience: 15 points. Accordingly, the maximum technical score remains 100 points. The scoring table in clause 3.2.3.6, which reflects a maximum of 20 points for Local Knowledge and Relevant Experience, should be read as containing the scoring thresholds only. The score achieved under that criterion will be normalised to the prescribed weighting of 15 points for evaluation purposes. The applicable total score for the Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection evaluation is therefore 100 points, and not 105 points.
27	9. "The company-experience scoring bands in Annexure 1 under Part 2 seem to differ for each Part 2 appointment. Examples include: • 5–10 and 10–15, creating overlap at 10; • 10–15 and 15–20, creating overlap at 15; • for Industry transition, facilitation and engagement, the scale jumps from 15–20 to 25–30, leaving 21–24 unallocated. Please provide corrected, mutually exclusive company-experience scoring ranges for each Part 2 appointment, including the intended score for 21–24 projects/assignments under Industry transition, facilitation and engagement?	For evaluation purposes, the intention is that the company-experience bands be interpreted as mutually exclusive ranges, with the lower bound inclusive and the upper bound exclusive, except for the highest band. Accordingly, a score will not be duplicated where a value falls on a boundary between ranges. With respect to the Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement workstream, the omission of a scoring range for 21–24 projects/assignments is an administrative oversight. For evaluation purposes, it is confirmed that projects or assignments in the range 21–24 will be allocated the same score as the 25–30 band, namely 12 points. The scoring criteria will be applied in a reasonable and equitable manner to ensure that no tenderer is disadvantaged.
28	Administrative questions 10. Annexure 1 contains three Part 2 work areas and ends after section 3.2.3. Returnable Schedule A7 nevertheless requires methodology statements under sections 3.1.1.5, 3.1.2.6, 3.1.3.5 and 3.1.4.5, suggesting a missing fourth area or stale numbering. Please confirm that Part 2 contains only the following three areas for appointment: (1) industry transition; (2) transport planning and infrastructure design; and (3) transport operations, monitoring and inspection. Please confirm that the fourth methodology reference in Schedule A7 is an error and provide the corrected section references.	Part 2 comprises only the following three specialist areas: Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement; Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design, including Non-Motorised Transport and Universal Accessibility; and Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection. The reference in Schedule A7 to a methodology statement under clause 3.1.4.5 is an administrative error. No fourth Part 2 specialist area forms part of this tender. Accordingly, tenderers are required to submit methodology statements only for the relevant Part 2 specialist area(s) for which they are tendering.

30	I would kindly like to enquire whether the tender allows you to only tender for Part 1 or only Part 2. Additionally, are you able to only tender for one team under Part 2.	Yes. Tenderers may tender for Part 1 only or for Part 2 only, subject to the exclusivity requirements applicable to the Strategic Business Planning Team and the Technical Specialist Team. Where a tenderer elects to tender for Part 2, it may tender for one Part 2 workstream only, or for more than one Part 2 workstream. Each Part 2 workstream tendered for will be evaluated separately.
31	As no briefing session was held for this tender, we would appreciate clarification on whether this procurement relates to a new framework arrangement or forms part of an existing framework. If it forms part of an existing framework, could you kindly provide the relevant framework details or reference information.	This procurement relates to the appointment of professional and technical service providers under BID MT03/2026 for the Provincial Sustainable Transport Programme. It is not being procured as part of an existing framework arrangement. Accordingly, there are no existing framework details or reference information applicable to this tender. Tenderers must submit bids in accordance with the tender documentation issued for BID MT03/2026.
32	Please confirm whether a tenderer may submit a bid for only one, or any combination, of the following Part 2 specialist areas, without bidding for Part 1 or the remaining Part 2 areas: 1. Industry transition, facilitation and engagement; 2. Transport planning and infrastructure planning/design, including non-motorised transport and universal accessibility; and 3. Transport operations, monitoring and inspection.	Tenderers may submit a bid for one, any combination, or all of the Part 2 specialist areas listed below, without submitting a bid for Part 1: Industry Transition, Facilitation and Engagement; Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design, including Non-Motorised Transport and Universal Accessibility; and Transport Operations, Monitoring and Inspection. Each Part 2 specialist area will be evaluated independently. Tenderers are only required to submit the personnel, methodology statements and supporting returnables applicable to the selected Part 2 specialist area(s) for which they are tendering.
33	Clauses 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.3.2 of Annexure 1 permit tenderers to tender for multiple specialist or panel appointments. Please clarify how this permission is reconciled with clause 8.4.3 of the main document, which refers to achieving both Part 1 and Part 2 functionality thresholds, and Schedule C2's requirement to price all items. If selective bidding is permitted, please confirm: • whether each selected specialist area is evaluated and awarded independently; • whether a standalone Part 2 submission is permissible without nomination by a Part 1 bidder;	Tenderers may submit a bid for one, any combination, or all of the Part 2 specialist areas, without submitting a bid for Part 1. Each Part 2 specialist area tendered for will be evaluated independently and may be awarded independently of the other Part 2 specialist areas. A standalone Part 2 submission is permissible and does not require nomination by, or association with, a Part 1 bidder. This is subject to the exclusivity requirements applicable to Part 1 and Part 2. A tenderer that submits for Part 2 may not also submit for Part 1, and the same entities, personnel or resources may not be used in

	• which personnel, methodology and other returnables must be submitted for the selected area; and • how unselected areas and their associated pricing entries, illustrative disbursements and summary totals must be completed without rendering the bid non-responsive.	another tender submission contrary to the exclusivity provisions. Clause 8.4.3 must be read as applying only to the Part or Part 2 specialist area(s) for which a tenderer has submitted a bid. Accordingly, a tenderer is required to meet the functionality threshold applicable to the selected Part or selected Part 2 specialist area(s) and is not required to meet functionality thresholds for Parts or specialist areas for which it has not tendered. Tenderers are required to submit the personnel, methodology statements, company experience information, pricing and supporting returnables applicable to the selected Part 2 specialist area(s) only. Pricing schedules and returnables must be completed for each selected Part 2 specialist area in accordance with the tender instructions. Unselected specialist areas need not be supported by separate returnables or separately priced and may be marked as not applicable where the tender forms permit, provided that the submission clearly identifies the Part 2 specialist area(s) tendered for and does not create ambiguity in the comparative price evaluation.
34	1. Capacity requirements where one person occupies combined roles Response 6 confirms that sufficient capacity must be demonstrated, but does not state whether the prescribed minimum percentages are arithmetically cumulative. Please confirm: a. whether a person nominated as both CT05 Legal and Contractual Lead, requiring 35% capacity, and CT06 Corporate Governance Lead, requiring 50% capacity, must demonstrate a combined minimum availability of 85%; b. if the percentages are not cumulative, what minimum percentage or other capacity test will be applied to that individual; c. whether occupying one or more associated key specialist positions requires any additional capacity allocation; and d. how the combined allocation should be recorded in the prescribed capacity statement to avoid either double-counting or understating the resource's commitments.	The prescribed capacity percentages must be read in context. They are intended to demonstrate that the nominated resource has sufficient availability to perform the role or roles for which that person is proposed, and are not intended to be applied mechanically as a simple arithmetical addition in every instance where one person is nominated for more than one role. Accordingly, a person nominated as both CT05 Legal and Contractual Lead and CT06 Corporate Governance Lead is not automatically required to demonstrate a combined minimum availability of 85%. The tenderer must, however, demonstrate through the capacity statement that the individual has sufficient available capacity to perform all assigned responsibilities, taking into account the requirements of each role, any overlap between functions and the individual's existing commitments. Where the same individual is also nominated for one or more key specialist positions, no additional prescribed capacity percentage applies unless specifically stated in the tender documentation. The tenderer must nevertheless demonstrate that sufficient overall capacity exists for the individual to perform both the core team and key specialist responsibilities.

		The capacity statement should clearly identify each role for which the person is nominated, the proposed percentage or level of availability allocated to each role, the person's existing commitments and an explanation of how the combined responsibilities will be managed. This should be presented in a manner that avoids double-counting overlapping responsibilities or understating the resource's actual commitments. The Department's assessment will focus on the adequacy of the proposed resource allocation rather than the mechanical aggregation of prescribed percentages. The capacity statement must clearly identify each role for which the person is nominated, the proposed percentage or level of availability allocated to each role, the person's existing commitments, and an explanation of how the combined responsibilities will be managed. This is required to ensure that the evaluation can properly assess the resource's overall availability and avoid either double-counting overlapping responsibilities or understating the resource's actual commitments.
35	2. Leadership requirement for core-team positions The second part of question 9 asked whether leadership of a defined specialist workstream or assignment within a larger programme would satisfy the core-team leadership requirement, provided that the client verifies the leadership contribution. This aspect does not appear to have been answered expressly. Please confirm whether the leadership requirement may be satisfied where the proposed person led a defined legal, contractual, governance, institutional or other specialist workstream within a larger multidisciplinary programme, even though the person was not the overall programme manager. If so, please confirm that this may be demonstrated through the prescribed client reference, provided that the scope of the workstream, the person's accountability and the nature of the leadership contribution are clearly described.	Yes. The leadership requirement may be satisfied where the proposed individual led a clearly defined specialist workstream or assignment within a larger multidisciplinary programme, even if that individual was not the overall programme manager. For evaluation purposes, the reference evidence must clearly demonstrate that the individual held a leadership role relevant to the core-team position for which they are nominated. This may include leadership of a legal, contractual, governance, institutional, financial, transport planning, operational or other relevant specialist workstream, provided that the workstream was sufficiently defined and material to the broader programme.
36	3. References supporting more than one nominated position Responses 9 and 22 confirm that the same projects and references may support more than one position where the relevant responsibilities and competencies are demonstrated.	Where the same project or assignment is relied upon to support more than one nominated position, a single Part A form and corresponding Part B client assessment may be used, provided that the submission clearly demonstrates the experience and competencies relevant to each position claimed.

	Please clarify the required form of submission where this occurs: a. must separate Part A and Part B forms be completed for each position occupied by the same individual; or b. may one Part A and matching Part B reference set identify and substantiate all the positions supported by that project or assignment? Where one form may support multiple positions, please confirm that each relevant position should be listed expressly and that the description of the individual's responsibilities should address the criteria for each position.	Accordingly, separate Part A and Part B forms are not required solely because the same individual is nominated for multiple positions. A single Part A and matching Part B reference set may support multiple positions, provided that all relevant positions are expressly identified and the description of the individual's role, responsibilities and contribution adequately demonstrates compliance with the requirements of each position. The assessment will focus on whether the reference evidence sufficiently substantiates the experience and competencies required for each position for which the individual is nominated.
37	4. Meaning of different projects or assignments The tender requires three references from different projects or assignments. Please confirm whether separate contracts, task orders or defined assignments undertaken for the same client and within the same broader programme may be treated as different assignments, provided that: a. each had a separately identifiable scope, period and set of deliverables; b. the individual's responsibilities under each assignment are separately described; and c. the client verifies each assignment in the prescribed form.	Separate contracts, task orders or clearly defined assignments undertaken for the same client, or within the same broader programme, may be treated as different projects or assignments where each assignment is separately identifiable. For this purpose, the reference evidence must clearly demonstrate that each project or assignment had its own defined scope, period, deliverables and role for the nominated individual. The individual's responsibilities and contribution under each assignment must be described separately and must be capable of assessment against the relevant position requirements. Each assignment relied upon must be verified by the client in the prescribed form. Tenderers remain responsible for ensuring that the references submitted are sufficiently clear to enable the evaluation panel to distinguish between the assignments and to assess the relevance of each reference independently.
38	5. CT06 Corporate Governance Lead experience To ensure consistent interpretation of the CT06 scoring criteria, please clarify: a. whether experience in establishing minibus-taxi companies includes leading or providing material legal, institutional and governance advice for their establishment or restructuring, or whether the proposed person must have undertaken the formal incorporation process personally; b. whether contracts negotiated and concluded include amendments, extensions, interim agreements, negotiated deviations and replacement agreements, or only entirely new contracts; c. whether the relevant contracts must be contracts concluded directly with a minibus-taxi company, or whether other government contracts materially connected with minibus-taxi transition and operations may qualify; and	CT06 Corporate Governance Lead evaluation: a. Experience in establishing minibus taxi companies may include leading or providing significant legal, institutional, governance or advisory support for the establishment, restructuring or formalisation of such entities. Personal execution of the incorporation process is not required. b. Contracts negotiated and concluded may include new agreements, amendments, extensions, interim agreements, replacement agreements and similar negotiated contractual instruments, provided the individual's role is clearly demonstrated. c. Relevant contracts are not limited to those concluded directly with minibus taxi companies. Contracts materially related to minibus taxi transition, contracted services, institutional

	d. what constitutes ongoing governance support, including whether advisory support provided through successive assignments or periodic governance interventions will qualify.	development or public transport operations may also be considered. d. Ongoing governance support may include continuous, recurring or periodic governance advisory services, governance framework development, governance reviews, board or committee support, and related governance interventions over time. Tenderers remain responsible for ensuring that the reference evidence submitted is sufficiently detailed to enable evaluation against the CT06 Corporate Governance Lead requirements.
39	6. CT05 cross-sector experience Please clarify the meaning of "cross-sector experience" for the CT05 Legal and Contractual Lead evaluation. In particular, does "sector" refer to: a. different transport modes, such as road-based public transport, rail, non-motorised transport or aviation; b. different institutional or contracting environments within the transport sector; c. work undertaken across the public and private sectors; or d. broader economic or infrastructure sectors? Please also confirm whether experience on an integrated transport programme may support more than one sector where the individual performed distinct work relating to the relevant sectors.	For purposes of the CT05 Legal and Contractual Lead evaluation, "cross-sector experience" means experience gained across different public transport, institutional, regulatory, contractual or operational environments that are relevant to the role. The term is not limited to a single interpretation of "sector". Accordingly: a. Experience across different transport modes may be considered relevant where it demonstrates the required legal and contractual expertise. b. Experience across different institutional, governance, funding or contracting environments within the transport sector may be considered relevant. c. Experience gained across both the public and private sectors may be considered relevant where it relates to the role requirements. d. Experience in other economic or infrastructure sectors may be considered where it demonstrates directly relevant legal, contractual, governance or institutional expertise. Experience on an integrated transport programme may support more than one sector where the reference evidence clearly demonstrates distinct legal or contractual work relating to the relevant sectors. Tenderers remain responsible for ensuring that the evidence submitted is sufficiently detailed to enable evaluation against the CT05 requirements.
40	7. Electronic signatures and original documents Response 18 confirms that electronic signatures will be accepted on the prescribed project reference template. Please confirm that this applies to:	Electronic signatures will be accepted on the prescribed Project Reference Template, including both the Part A declaration signed by the proposed core-team member or key specialist and the corresponding Part B client assessment, provided that the signature can

	a. the Part A declaration signed by the proposed core-team member or key specialist; b. the corresponding Part B client assessment; and c. all copies of those forms included in the electronic tender submission. Please also confirm that no wet-ink original Part A or Part B forms need to be physically delivered by the tender closing date, provided that the electronic signatures are attributable and verifiable.	reasonably be attributed to the relevant signatory and can be verified if required. This does not alter the tender submission requirements. Tenderers must still submit their bids by hand delivery in the manner prescribed in the tender document, by the tender closing date and time. Electronically signed Part A and Part B forms may be included in the hand-delivered tender submission. Wet-ink originals are not required to be submitted separately by the tender closing date, provided that the signed copies included in the hand-delivered submission are complete, legible, attributable and capable of verification.
41	8. Supporting information for the capacity statement Please confirm what is required under the capacity statement where a proposed person discloses existing projects and commitments. In particular, please confirm whether the tenderer must provide documentary proof or a separate client reference for each current commitment, or whether identifying the client, assignment, responsible contact person and estimated time allocation will be sufficient. We would appreciate the Department's written clarification so that all tenderers can complete the resource nominations, references and capacity statements consistently.	Separate documentary proof or client references are not required for each disclosed commitment at tender submission stage. However, the capacity statement must provide sufficient information to enable assessment of the proposed resource's availability against their existing commitments. Tenderers should identify, at a minimum, the client, assignment or project, responsible contact person, estimated time allocation and duration of each current commitment. Tenderers remain responsible for ensuring that the capacity statement is accurate, complete and sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the proposed resource's availability for the role or roles nominated. Further information may be requested, or any information contained in the capacity statement may be verified, during the evaluation process.