

QUESTION AND ANSWERS

BID NO:

RAF/2026/00037

BID DESCRIPTION:

APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER TO REDESIGN AND REDEVELOP THE ROAD ACCIDENT FUND (RAF) WEBSITE INCLUDING SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE, FOR A PERIOD OF TWO (2) YEARS.

1. **Briefing Session – Could you please advise if the briefing won't accommodate virtual session or it will strictly want physical attendance?**

Answer: No, it was strictly physical attendance, and it was non-compulsory briefing session.

2. **Existing Website Details - The RFP states the current website is nearing the end of life, but it does not specify: RAF upgraded the CMS from SharePoint 2016 to SharePoint SE, so end-of-life is no longer a concern.**

- **Current CMS** (SharePoint SE)
- **Current technology stack** (HTML running on SharePoint SE)
- **Current hosting model** (Hosted at AWS, running on an instance)
- **Current pain points** (As per the BID specifications)
- **Existing content volume** (Unknown at the moment, but not huge when noting that the current website is static)

Answer: In red above

3. **Guidewire Integration Scope - The document mentions integration with Guidewire but does not clarify:**

- **Which Guidewire modules are implemented?** ClaimsCenter and ContactManager
- **Are APIs already available?** (Guidewire is API compatible. The appointed service provider (SP) will develop the code. API related information will be made available after contracting) An Enterprise Integration layer will also be provided for API integration.
 - **Will we be expected to develop integration services?** (SP will develop the integration using API as per the bullet above)
 - **What business processes will be exposed through Guidewire?** (Claim lodgments and claim tracking)

Centurion: 420 Witch Hazel Road, Eco Glades 2, Centurion 0046 | Private Bag X178 Centurion 0046
T: +27 12 621 1600 | **Contact Centre:** +27 87 820 1 111 | www.raf.co.za

Board Members: Mr Kenneth Brown (Chairperson), Ms Nonhlanhla Mabusela-Aikhuere (Deputy Chairperson), Ms Ntswaki Kutumela, Ms Innocentia Mmule Pule, Mr Richard Dyantyi, Mr Mpontshane Alfred Mkhapheni, Ms Alfredina Themba, Mr Neeshan Balton, Ms Tsakani Mashimbye (Director-General's Representative)

Answer: In red above

4. **Existing Digital Landscape - Could you provide an overview of the current digital ecosystem, including the existing website technology stack, CMS (if any), hosting environment, current integrations, and the specific pain points or limitations that the redevelopment is intended to address?**

Why this matters to us: It determines migration strategy, content migration effort, reuse opportunities, and the target architecture.

Answer: The current website is a basic static website running on SharePoint SE hosted at AWS. The operating System is Windows 2022. The content and configuration databases are hosted on SQL Server 2022. The appointed Service Provider (SP) is expected to develop a new website and portals from the start, i.e. no upgrade of the existing website is expected. The Bidder must propose a CMS that complies with the BID specification. RAF wishes to have a website that provides reliable 24/7 self-service to the South African public.

5. **Enterprise Integration Scope - Could you provide detailed information on the systems that require integration (including Guidewire, CRM, identity services, document repositories, payment systems, and other backend platforms), along with the availability of APIs, integration standards, and ownership of those interfaces?**

Why this matters to us: Integration is likely to be one of the highest cost and schedule drivers. Understanding the existing interfaces, authentication mechanisms, and data exchange requirements is essential for designing a robust solution and preparing an accurate commercial proposal.

Answer: Integration is expected to be done on:

- Guidewire and its modules are:
 - Guidewire ClaimCenter, which is responsible for claims registration and processing
 - Guidewire Customer Engage, which is responsible for direct claims lodgments. It has not been implemented yet and may still not be implemented during the website project.
 - Guidewire ContactManager, which is responsible for claimant and claimant representatives' contact details.
 - Guidewire VendorEngage, which is responsible for claims-related vendor registration. This module is not yet available and may still not be available at the time the website is developed.
 - Guidewire document repository is SharePoint Online
- Legacy Claims System. It is in-house developed. The solution has modules developed from Visual Basic (VB) 6, and other modules are developed using .NET. The databases are SQL Server and Informix, with Informix as the main database. The solution is API-compatible, and the internal team is available to provide the necessary information.
- RAF is planning to source EDRMS. It doesn't exist currently and may still not be available by the time the website is developed. Our current document repository is SharePoint Online.
- Digital Customer Engagement (DCE) portal. The website is expected to provide access to the DEC portal via a hyperlink.

6. **Our work covers responsive public-facing websites, content architecture, accessibility,**

CMS development, migration, integrations, security hardening, testing, documentation, and support - Could you please confirm whether an international provider may submit directly, or whether South African CSD, tax, B-BBEE, insurance, or local-partner requirements must be satisfied at the submission stage?

If a local consortium is required, I would also appreciate confirmation that international technical subcontractors are permitted.

Answer: **Yes, the international provider may participate. However, data that requires compliance with the Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA) is expected to be hosted within South Africa.**

7. Website & Portal Functionality, Design, and Use Cases -

1. Phase Boundaries & Multilingual Support

a. Phase 1 vs. Phase 2 Delivery: The terms of reference outline Phase 1 as website development and Phase 2 as portal functionality. Will these phases run sequentially with distinct Go-Live dates, or will they be managed under a unified delivery track within the two-year contract period?

Answer: **Phase 1 is expected to go live first, followed by the portal functionality. The Service Provider may execute both phases in parallel. All phases must be completed fully within two (2) years.**

b. Language Requirements: The evaluation criteria for the system demonstration notes "Language and Accessibility Options" and the Smart Claims Navigator mentions multi-language support. Is there a definitive list of official South African or international languages required beyond English?

Answer: **Official South African Languages.**

c. Translation Sources: Will all translated content and dynamic prompts be provided directly by the RAF, or is the platform expected to handle automated machine translations

Answer: **The solution provider is expected to deliver an all-inclusive solution that complies with the BID specification.**

8. UI/UX Design & Logic Boundaries

a. Design Assets & CI Guidelines: The pricing schedule allocates exactly 504 hours for "Website design". Does the RAF have an existing, approved design system, UI/UX wireframes, or branding guidelines that must be adhered to, or is the service provider expected to conduct UX discovery from scratch?

Answer: **Branding guidelines will be provided.**

b. Logic Duplication in Systems of Record (SoR): The RFP states that the portal should facilitate input capture and orchestration without duplicating backend business logic or calculation rules (e.g., the Actuarial Calculation Engine and Medical Tariff System). Are the APIs for these underlying engines fully matured, documented, and ready for integration, or will the engineering partner be required to co-develop endpoints on the SoR side?

Answer: All Off-the-shelf solutions used by the Road Accident Fund (RAF) have maintenance and support. If information on the API is limited, solution vendors may be contacted. Internal developers may assist with the APIs for the in-house-developed solutions where necessary.

9. OEM of the CMS

a. It seems the expectation here is for us to submit proof that we are an accredited partner of the CMS. Some CMSs are open source, e.g. A popular example is WordPress. The WordPress organisation does not offer a standard "accredited" partner program. We are not saying we will use WordPress as the CMS,. However, were cases like this considered when drawing up your RFP, where the proposed CMS does not necessarily offer an accreditation?

Answer: This criterion is expected to provide the RAF with assurance that the provider is competent to implement the product. That assurance can be provided by the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM). The Road Accident Fund does not wish to implement a solution that lacks maintenance and support from the Original Equipment Manufacturer.

b. If an agency proposes using its own in-house CMS for this project, please share the necessary information or document contents required for "certification" to mark it as compliant for this project. All we know is that it needs to have the official letterhead of the company (the agency, which is also the OEM of the CMS).

Answer: If you are the OEM then you are expected to have obtained the status/accreditation from the trusted bodies like SGS South Africa or Bureau Veritas

c. Are you able to share examples of CMS options that you would deem acceptable and appropriate for your project.

Answer: Please refer to the BID specification to ensure expectations are met.

10. Third-Party Systems & Integrations

1. Portal Overlays & Identity Management

a. Holistic Portal View: The document notes that both Guidewire and the RAF CRM have pre-existing portals , and the new website must "offer a holistic view of all the RAF's portals without interfering with their functionalities". Does this imply a Single Sign-On (SSO) setup using federated protocols like OAuth or OpenID Connect across all portals , or simply visual dashboard cross-linking?

Answer: No. There will be no single sign-on on different portals. The website should provide links to all the portals. The provider should not rework existing logic unless necessary and agreed to with the RAF.

b. Central Authentication: Since all users must be centrally authenticated , is there an operational Identity and Access Management (IAM) framework already managing claimant and supplier identities , or does a new user directory need to be constructed?

Answer: Portal use will be optional for claimants; therefore, they are expected to register voluntarily before using the portal. Therefore, the new user directory needs to be constructed.

11. External Systems & AI Capabilities

a. State Entity Integrations: Several advanced use cases require real-time validation against external databases, specifically the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) for biometrics , SAPS for incident verification , and the HPCSA for medical credentials. Does the RAF have existing, active API bridges or ESB access to these state entities, or is the service provider responsible for navigating security clearances and building these direct relationships?

Answer: RAF is currently connecting to DHA through APIs. The developer is expected to use the same Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that the RAF has with DHA. If any other external links are required by the RAF, the RAF will have to establish the MoU.

b. OCR and Metadata Extraction: The cradle-to-grave claims process highlights document collection via OCR/AI. Does the RAF want a cloud-native OCR solution configured inside their AWS ecosystem (e.g., AWS Textract), or should the provider quote on a third-party framework?

Answer: The bidder is expected to propose a secure solution that meets the BID specification.

12. Content & Database Migration

1. Scope of Legacy Data

a. Migration Volume: The scope requires data migration from the old website to the new production environment at Go-Live. Can the RAF provide specific volumes regarding the data to be migrated, such as the total number of legacy pages, active tender listings , and existing media assets?

Answer: These would include tender documents, media statements, and annual reports. Data (documents) will be agreed upon between the relevant business function and the provider. Only the necessary documents are expected to be migrated, and they are expected to be few or none.

b. Content Responsibility: To ensure project roles are clear, will the RAF provide all finalized copywriting, educational materials , driver safety course documentation, and media assets, or is any form of content generation expected to form part of the technical partner's scope?

Answer: RAF is expected to provide content material.

13. Hosting, Infrastructure, and Security

1. Environment and Scale

a. Cloud Provisioning: The solution is specified to run within the RAF's AWS/Azure multi-cloud environment. Will the RAF technical team provision the baseline hosting infrastructure, databases, and landing zones , or will the provider be expected to architecturalise and provision the baseline cloud accounts from scratch?

Answer: RAF uses AWS cloud services as the mainstay; however, the RAF has adopted a multi-cloud strategy, therefore, the RAF is willing to discuss any cloud environment that will optimise the proposed solution.

b. Traffic and Sizing: What are the historical or projected monthly traffic volumes, page views, and concurrent user peak loads for the public website and portals to assist in accurate cloud performance scaling?

Answer: We had around 4500 visits in March 2026, according to Ahrefs Traffic Checker. The portal is expected to attract more visits.

14. Cybersecurity & Verification

a. Penetration Testing Execution: The technical scope notes that website penetration testing must happen after go-live. Will the RAF bring in their own independent, accredited cybersecurity firm to audit the site, or is the engineering provider required to include third-party pen-testing within their proposal?

Answer: The SP is expected to conduct the pen-test.

15. General, Administrative, and Evaluation Criteria

1. Technical Scoring Realignment a. E-Commerce Reference: Evaluation Criterion 13.2.1 specifies that bidders must have at least 5 years of experience in "the development of e-commerce websites". Given that the RAF is a specialized social insurance fund focused on claims processing and legal document submission registers, will the RAF confirm that verified experience building complex transactional enterprise web applications, secure client portals, and secure citizen registers will be scored interchangeably with traditional retail e-commerce platforms?

Answer: The e-commerce experience is required to ensure competency in portal development. Any portal development experience should suffice.

2. Commercial Pricing Adjustments a. Fixed Pricing Schedule Hours: The Bill of Quantities (BOQ) defines exact hourly estimates for tasks, such as 4,032 hours for Website/Portal development. Are these exact numbers a mandatory compliance threshold that must be mirrored in the financial proposal, or are bidders permitted to adjust the hours based on their recommended tech stack and Agile deployment framework?

Answer: Bidders are expected to populate the table; however, they may include additional tables to suit their pricing. The provisioned table will standardize the response for fair comparison.

b. Please explain why some line items are "greyed out" (Website Penetration Testing, Website Go Live, Support and Stabilisation, Content Management System) and how we are expected to price these - i.e. do you not require hours estimated, and simply a fixed cost for those line items?

Answer: The greyed items are expected to be executed in the first year. Year 2 will be support and stabilization.

16. Technical Demo

a. Is the expectation for us to start developing the project, prior to being appointed as the selected service provider, in order to deliver a functioning technical demo? The demo then

needs to include a specific set of features and functionalities that we must showcase in the session, scoring us on a point system. We can demo examples of other work we have done in the past, however, some of the items you want demo'd are very specific, so we would not have examples of other projects to demo all the required items.

Answer: **Yes, demo the work you did before.**

b. Is it acceptable to develop a quick POC (proof of concept) to demo the features to you, by means of AI (Artificial Intelligence). Or must the demo be built using the actual code and CMS of the final product.

Answer: **Prototype is acceptable, but bidders are expected to have done similar work before.**

17. Exit & Handover

1. Format, training & IP

a. What format and level of detail is required for the final handover documentation?

b. Are there any requirements for training RAF staff on the new website and systems?

c. What is the process for credential transfer and IP handover?

Answer: **Training is expected to be on the job whilst the project is running. Handover will be carried out gradually during the support phase. Support and stabilization will be done jointly with the RAF resources.**

18. Section 6.1 - Section 6.1 specifies cloud-native architecture — is there an existing VPC, network topology, or AWS landing zone the bidder must integrate with, or is the architecture designed from scratch?

Answer: **VPN exists.**

19. Section 6.2 & 13.1 - Section 13.1 requires the bidder to be an OEM or OEM-accredited partner of the proposed CMS — does RAF have a preferred CMS in mind, or is the selection entirely the bidder's to propose as stated in Section 6.2?

Answer: **RAF did not specify the software technology. The bidder must propose the best that meets the specification.**

20. Use Case 7.12 - Use Case 7.12 (Whistleblower Portal) requires anonymous submission with encrypted data handling — what level of technical anonymity is required (e.g., no-IP-logging, Tor-compatible, third-party routing)?

Answer: **A whistleblower is not expected to reveal personal details unless doing so is voluntary. They are not expected to register on the site to report suspicious activity; rather, they should do so anonymously. An option to reveal identity must be provided.**

21. Section 6.5 - Section 6.5 specifies AI chatbot, sentiment analysis, intelligent search, and heatmaps — is the bidder free to propose the AI platform (e.g., AWS Bedrock), or does RAF prescribe a specific toolset?

Answer: **Yes.**

22. Section 6.5. Intelligent Features - Please expand on requirements for sentiment analysis. Do you require an option on each page that allows a user to provide textual feedback or do you want reporting that highlights where users are dropping off when navigating the website?

Answer: **Mainly where users are providing text, but you are allowed to exceed expectations.**

23. Use Case 7.9 - Use Case 7.9 (Smart Claims Navigator) includes multi-language support — which languages are required at launch? Is this a minimum of isiZulu, Afrikaans, and English, or all 11 official languages?

Answer: **Official South African languages.**

24. Use Case 7.9 - Use Case 7.9 requires the AI chatbot to handle live claims queries — does this require Guidewire integration at Phase 1 launch, or is the chatbot limited to FAQ/informational content initially?

Answer: **Smart Claims Navigator is a digital assistant that provides interactive guidance to portal users.**

25. Section 9 - Section 9 states training should occur 'without interfering with project timelines' — how many RAF technical staff need to be trained, and what is their current technical skill level?

Answer: **Minimum employment requirement at RAF is NQF level 6. The number is not finalised as we are still reviewing the departmental structure.**

26. Section 10 - Section 10 references handover to 'the RAF development and support team' — does this team currently exist and what is its size, or is RAF building this internal capability during the contract period?

Answer: **Yes, the team exists, but it is not yet finalised due to the departmental restructuring. The team is expected to be capacitated further during the project.**

27. Sections 13.2.3-13.2.6 & Section 11 - Sections 13.2.3-13.2.6 score four specific roles (BA, Senior Developer, Designer, PM), but Section 11 defines a broad scope including architecture design, security, DevOps, UAT, and penetration testing. Is the bidder expected to propose a full team structure covering all delivery disciplines beyond the four scored CVs? Will RAF evaluate or place any restrictions on the size, composition, or on-site/remote presence requirements of the broader proposed team?

Answer: **There will be no restrictions on the size and composition of the team deployed by the SP.**

28. Section 13.2.3 - For the BA, Is there an existing requirements repository for business rules or process documentations

Answer: **No requirements, but business rules exist.**

29. What is the expected format and level of detail for the final requirements document deliverable and who signs off on it?

Answer: Each business function will sign its own requirements. RAF Project Management Office (PMO) will guide on the format.

30. Section 11 - Who owns UAT test case design and execution.

Answer: RAF owns the test cases' final design and execution in collaboration with the Vendor.

31. Functional Scope, User Journeys and Business Processes - Phase 1 website / Phase 2 portal What functionality is included in Phase 1 (website) vs Phase 2 (portal)? Which of the 14 use cases in 7 are in scope for each phase?

Answer: Phase 1 is website-only. The emulation of the current website. Phase two will include the portals for all listed use cases where systems of record are available.

32. Functional Scope, User Journeys and Business Processes: EOL mid-2026; 12: Timelines Does RAF have a fixed or target go-live date for Phase 1? Is there a hard operational or legislative deadline?

Answer: Phase 1 should be completed within 1 to 2 months, as it is a simple website. Phase 2 should be completed within 8 months. The remaining 12 months are stabilization and support.

33. Functional Scope, User Journeys and Business Processes: Digital transformation background What are the primary pain points and gaps in the current as-is claimant, attorney, and supplier digital experience that this project is intended to resolve?

Answer: Improved communication with stakeholders. Ease of submission of required documents. Updating of contact details by claimants and suppliers. Dissemination of the right information to the right people. 24/7 Self-service. Claim tracking by the claimant and service providers.

34. Functional Scope, User Journeys and Business Processes: Digitisation intent; 7.2: Legal Doc Platform Which current manual, email-based, or paper-based processes are being replaced by this portal?

Answer: Summonses and other related docs

35. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Integration with existing portals Can RAF provide a system landscape diagram showing all systems the new portal must integrate with, indicating: current production status, planned upgrades, and which APIs are already available vs still to be built?

Answer: No diagram is available. Please refer to No. 5 in this document.

36. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Integration landscape Are all 15+ back-end systems listed as integration targets (Guidewire, EDRMS, Medical Systems, Finance/ERP,

Fraud Investigation, etc.) currently live in production? Are any planned for upgrade, replacement, or decommission within the 2-year contract period?

Answer: Not all the listed systems are available, e.g. EDRMS is still in the pipeline. Guidewire, Finance system (SAP ECC), and Legacy claim system are available and are API-compatible.

- 37. Data Migration, Reports and Dashboards: Data migration from old website Please provide a content inventory for the existing website: number of pages, document types and counts (PDFs, forms), media assets (images, videos), and estimated data volume.**

Answer: Documents to be migrated are PDFs. Only the necessary documents will be migrated, and the necessity will be determined by the data owners. Documents are largely tenders and media statements.

- 38. Data Migration, Reports and Dashboards: Migration and go-live scope What is the intended migration approach: (a) big-bang cutover (old site goes down, new goes live simultaneously) or (b) phased migration with both sites running in parallel during a transition window?**

Answer: The old site will be switched off when phase one goes live. All the necessary documents should be migrated before switch-off.

- 39. Data Migration, Reports and Dashboards: Decommission old website After migration, who is responsible for reviewing and signing off that migrated content is accurate, complete, and correctly formatted on the new site — RAF content team or the SP? Is there an acceptance process for migrated content?**

Answer: The RAF's QA team, Marketing team and relevant business functions.

- 40. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Core business system is Guidewire Are all integrations provided over an API gateway or its equivalent for the system to consume?**

Answer: All systems are API compatible. Vendors and in-house developers will share information where necessary.

- 41. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Core business system is Guidewire Does the existing Guidewire deployment expose documented REST or SOAP APIs for claim submission, status query, and eligibility rules? Which Guidewire version and modules (ClaimCenter, PolicyCenter) are deployed? Will API documentation be shared with shortlisted bidders?**

Answer: Yes, API information may be shared after contracting. Please refer to number 5 in this document for more information.

- 42. Existing Systems and System Landscape: EDRMS as authoritative document store Does RAF's EDRMS expose APIs for document upload, metadata tagging, versioning, and retrieval? Which EDRMS platform is deployed (e.g., OpenText, SharePoint, Alfresco, Documentum)?**

Answer: EDRMS, as outlined in the BID spec, has not yet been deployed. It is still in the pipeline.

RAF is currently using SharePoint as a document repository.

- 43. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Centralised authentication, SSO, MFA** Does RAF have an existing Identity Provider (IDAM) the portal must federate to (e.g., Azure AD/Entra ID, AWS Cognito, Keycloak)? Will the new portal share SSO with Guidewire's portal and the CRM portal?

Answer: The BID specification does not give a solution, but outlines the problem. The specifications indicated that there will be an architecture and solution design.

- 44. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Home Affairs identity verification** Does RAF currently have a contracted API integration with the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) for real-time identity verification? If not, is RAF responsible for establishing this agreement, or is the SP expected to? Is a test environment available?

Answer: Yes, RAF has MoU with DHA, and RAF is currently consuming the DHA data through APIs.

- 45. Existing Systems and System Landscape: API-driven architecture** Will RAF provide API documentation (OpenAPI/Swagger or equivalent) for all primary integration systems — Guidewire, EDRMS, CRM, IAM, Medical Systems, Finance/ERP, Fraud Investigation — to shortlisted bidders before or at contract award?

Answer: Information will be provided after contracting.

- 46. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Holistic view without interfering** "What does 'holistic view of all RAF portals' mean in practice for the Guidewire and CRM portals? Please confirm whether the expected integration pattern is: (a) SSO gateway and navigational deep-links to existing Guidewire and CRM portals (portal-to-portal navigation only),

Answer: Create links to the existing portals. Do not interfere with their functionalities unless necessary.

(b) iFrame embedding of Guidewire/CRM content within the RAF portal UI, or (c) full API-based data aggregation — where Guidewire and CRM data is fetched via APIs and rendered natively in the RAF portal UI. We propose Option (a) as the baseline scope to avoid re-architecting existing portal functionality."

Answer: Please put your proposal in the RFP response.

- 47. Existing Systems and System Landscape: SAPS incident verification** Does RAF have a contracted API with SAPS for accident/incident verification? Is this integration live in a test environment, or must it be established as part of this project?

Answer: RAF is responsible for establishing the MoU where they do not exist.

- 48. Existing Systems and System Landscape: Real-time supplier validation** Are the APIs for SARS tax status, CIPC company registration, HPCSA practitioner verification, and CSD supplier status already contracted and available to RAF in a test/sandbox environment for UC

7.5 (Supplier Registration)?

Answer: RAF is responsible for establishing the MoU where they do not exist.