



transport

Department:
Transport
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**TENDER NO:
DOT/10/2026/PT**

**APPOINTMENT OF A SERVICE PROVIDER/CONSULTANT TO PROVIDE
TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT AND MONITOR INTEGRATED
PUBLIC TRANSPORT NETWORKS (IPTNS) IN THE CLUSTER A MUNICIPALITIES
OF CAPE TOWN, GEORGE AND NELSON MANDELA BAY**

**BRIEFING NOTES AND RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS
DURING AND AFTER THE VIRTUAL BRIEFING SESSION HELD ON THE 11
SEPTEMBER 2026**

SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

(a) Introduction

These Briefing Notes are issued in terms of the Department of Transport's Virtual Briefing Session held on 11 September 2026 for the above-mentioned tender, as the formal step in a procurement process and is subject to all the terms and conditions contained in the TOR.

Unless otherwise expressly stated, or the context otherwise requires, words and expressions defined in the TOR shall bear the same meanings in these Briefing Notes as those ascribed to them in the TOR.

(b) Purpose of the Briefing Notes

The purpose of this Briefing Notes is to:

- a. Provide bidders responses to their questions during and after he briefing session

(c) Schedule of Briefing Notes issued

Briefing Notes 1:

- a. Responses to bidder's queries up to 18 September 2026.

Disclaimer

Note that all responses are provided in good faith and without prejudice to the Department. The Department however, reserves the right to review any or all of the responses depending on actual proposal submissions received.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
Conflict of interest – existing municipal work: Does an existing contract with Cape Town, George or Nelson Mandela Bay constitute a conflict of interest, including contracts relating to unrelated roads, water, structures or other engineering work, or does the restriction apply only to IPTN, PTNG or public transport-related work?	TOR – Conflict of Interest provisions	The restriction applies to IPTN, PTNG and public transport related work.
Project Leader – relevant experience: Does the required IPTN experience have to be specifically on projects formally designated as IPTN, or will experience on IRPTN, BRT, IRT, integrated public transport planning, PTNG-funded assignments or comparable public transport reform projects be considered relevant?	TOR – Project Leader / Experience	The scoring table specifically refers to “relevant experience” and the note states that relevant experience means experience in IPTN projects. Accordingly, experience should be demonstrated in relation to IPTN projects as defined in the TOR. Furthermore, IRPTN, BRT, IRT, and integrated public transport planning are elements of the IPTN.
Project Leader – reference letters: Must the reference letter specifically identify the proposed Project Leader, or would a reference letter issued in the name of the company be sufficient?	TOR – Project Leader / Reference Letters	The reference should focus on the proposed Project Leader and demonstrate the experience of the individual proposed for the position, rather than merely demonstrating the company's experience.
Transport Economist qualification: Would a Civil Engineering qualification satisfy the requirement for the Transport Economist	TOR – Key Personnel / Qualifications	Yes. The clarification provided was that the reference to “civil engineering slash or” was intended to accommodate the relevant transport economics/traffic engineering field.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
competency, or is a specific Transport Economics qualification required?		Civil Engineering would therefore be acceptable, subject to the requirements of the TOR.
Ongoing projects: May bidders include projects that are still in progress as relevant experience, or will only completed projects be considered?	TOR – Experience	Ongoing projects may be included. Bidders should clearly indicate that the project is ongoing and provide the relevant start date and anticipated/end date. Completed projects may also be submitted.
“More than 10 years” experience: Does the requirement for “more than 10 years” mean that bidders must have a minimum of 10 years’ experience to qualify?	TOR – Experience Scoring	No. The clarification provided was that 10 years represents the maximum scoring level, and not a minimum requirement. The applicable scoring table in the bid document will apply.
Accounting competency: What is the intended role of the Accounting competency? Can a suitably qualified financial professional, financial modeller or Transport Economist with demonstrated financial capability satisfy this requirement?	TOR – Key Personnel / Competencies	The clarification provided was that a suitably qualified person with the required financial capability may satisfy the competency. The bidder's methodology and proposed team should demonstrate an understanding of the required financial/accounting functions. Accounting or Business Management expertise may be advantageous. It was further indicated that accounting qualification is included under composition of the team.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
Multiple competencies: May one individual satisfy more than one competency, for example Transport Economics and Accounting, or Business Economics and Accounting, or must each competency be allocated to a separate team member?	TOR – Key Personnel / Team Composition	The bidder's methodology and proposed team should demonstrate an understanding of the required responsibility. It is the responsibility of the prospective bidders to demonstrate how they intend to deploy resources to meet the Department's expectations.
Team experience scoring: For the 30 points allocated to Team Experience, will the Department assess the cumulative experience of the team or use the experience of the most experienced individual?	TOR – Evaluation Criteria	The 30 points are allocated across five competency areas: Civil/Traffic Engineering (7), Transport Economics (7), Business Economics/Management (6), Law (5) and Accounting (5). Where team members share experience in the same field and same category, this is treated as one experience. Therefore, the scoring will be based on the relevant experience demonstrated by the proposed team within each competency area.
Methodology scoring: The methodology scoring appears to move from 15 points to 30 points. Is this distinction intentional, and what objective distinction will be applied between the different scoring levels?	TOR – Evaluation Criteria / Methodology	Methodology is one of the key evaluation criteria for this bid with a maximum weight of 30 points. It is therefore the intention of the Department to give more points to the prospective bidders who has provided a detailed Project plan that meets and exceeds expectations with alignment to Project management principles covering project Milestones over project duration with a

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
		suitable contingency plan based on project management principles.
Skills-transfer requirements: What specific skills-transfer outputs are expected from the service provider? Is there a minimum number of officials to be trained, prescribed interventions or competencies, and must the skills transfer be formal training or may it include on-the-job knowledge transfer?	TOR – Skills Transfer	The bidder's proposal should demonstrate how the bidder intends to capacitate the department's officials who are involved in the project.
Primary role of the PSP: Is the primary role of the service provider to act as an independent programme assurance and monitoring adviser to the Department, or will the service provider be embedded as technical support to the municipalities?	TOR – Scope of Work	Provide a technical support to the department and monitoring of IPTNs in municipalities.
Independence of monitoring: How is the service provider expected to maintain independence where it provides technical support to municipalities while also reviewing and monitoring the municipalities' work?	TOR – Monitoring / Technical Support	The service provider is expected to provide a technical support to the department and monitoring of IPTNs in municipalities.
Level of effort / team deployment: Is the Department expecting permanent or full-time resources to be deployed for the duration of the contract, or will the appointment operate on an output-based advisory model?	TOR – Scope / Team Requirements	The services of a service provider are expected to be available to functions in line with the deliverables as provided in the TOR.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
Standing team versus task orders: Will the successful service provider maintain a standing team throughout the 36-month contract, or will specific task orders/work requests be issued against the contract ceiling?	TOR – Contract / Scope	The services of a service provider are expected to be available to perform functions in line with the deliverables as provided in the TOR.
Site visits: The TOR refers to monitoring and meetings. Does the requirement for quarterly engagement imply a quarterly site visit to each of the three municipalities?	TOR – Monitoring / Meetings	Quarterly site visit reports are one of the key deliverables as per the TOR. Therefore, a quarterly site visit report per municipality will be required.
Expected level of effort: Is there an indicative level of effort for municipal meetings, technical reviews, financial assessments, budget reviews and presentations over the 36-month contract period?	TOR – Scope / Deliverables	It is the understanding of the Department that service providers must deploy their best teams when performing this task, and this will be demonstrated throughout the service provider's proposal.
Municipal information: What historical PTNG/IPTN technical, operational and financial information will the Department make available to the appointed service provider at commencement of the contract?	TOR – Information / Deliverables	It is the understanding of the Department that service providers will demonstrate the understanding of the work at hand, and this will be demonstrated throughout the service provider's proposal.
Annexure D discrepancy: The compliance workbook supplied as Annexure D appears to contain organisational-design deliverables that do not relate to the IPTN Terms of	Annexure D / Bid Document	The sheet titled "Compliance with TOR Checklist" contained in the editable Annexure D workbook was inadvertently included and does not form part of this bid. Bidders are requested to disregard that sheet. The remaining Annexure D templates relating to Company Experience, Proposed Team

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
Reference. Will a corrected Annexure D be issued?		and Team Experience remain applicable and unchanged.
Quarterly meetings and workshop costs: For quarterly meetings and strategic workshops, are bidders expected to provide for venue hire, refreshments/catering, audio-visual equipment and other meeting-related costs, or will the Department provide the meeting logistics?	TOR – Meetings / Workshops	Quarterly meetings are held at municipal level and at the national Department of transport
Meeting/workshop costs: If the service provider is expected to carry the costs of meetings and workshops, should these costs be included within the ceiling price? Are bidders expected to make standard attendance assumptions for pricing purposes?	TOR – Pricing / Meetings	Meetings/ workshop are held at municipal level and at the national Department of transport
Use of premises: May bidders assume that meetings will be held at Departmental or municipal premises, or virtually, and therefore exclude venue and catering costs from their pricing?	TOR – Meetings / Pricing	Meetings/ workshop are held at municipal level and at the national Department of transport
Travel and subsistence: How should travel and subsistence costs for visits to Cape Town, George and Nelson Mandela Bay be treated? Should these costs be included in	TOR – Pricing / Travel	These should be included in your costing.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
the bid price or reimbursed separately based on approved travel?		
Pricing model: What pricing structure is expected between deliverable-based pricing and daily professional rates, particularly for ad hoc technical requests that cannot be predicted at the commencement of the contract?	TOR – Pricing / Financial Proposal	The bidder should include all the costs in their bid as no cost adjustment will be entertained during the cause of the project.
Escalation: Should bidders provide firm rates for the full 36-month period with escalation incorporated into the rates, or will annual escalation based on an applicable index be permitted?	TOR – Pricing	The bidder should include all the costs in their bid as no cost adjustment will be entertained during the cause of the project.
Time-based versus lump-sum appointment: Is the appointment intended to operate as a time-based professional services contract, with person-days charged against agreed rates subject to a ceiling, or as a lump-sum/deliverable-based contract?	TOR – Contract / Pricing	Deliverable based
Payment mechanism: The draft SLA refers to Tasks 1–8 and percentage-based payments, while the TOR does not clearly define Tasks 1–8. Will payment be based on monthly time charges, completed deliverables or the fixed	Draft SLA – Payment Schedule	Payment will be deliverable based. The draft SLA payment schedule is indicative and will be aligned to the agreed deliverables and final contract arrangements upon appointment.

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
milestone percentages contained in the SLA?		
Wet-ink signatures: Are original wet-ink signatures required on the SBDs, declarations, preference forms and other returnable documents, or will printed/scanned/electronic signatures be acceptable?	Bid Returnables / SBDs	Bidders must submit signed bid documents. The Department will evaluate submitted documents in accordance with the bid requirements and applicable SCM prescripts.
Certification of qualifications: Must bidders submit printed copies of certified qualifications and supporting documents, or are original certified hard copies required? Is there a maximum period within which certification must have been completed?	TOR / Returnable Documents	Bidders are required to submit certified copies of qualifications and supporting documents as part of their bid submission. Original qualification certificates are not required for bid purposes. Certified copies that are clear, legible and capable of verification will be accepted. The Department reserves the right to verify the authenticity of any qualification, certification or supporting document submitted by a bidder. The bid documents do not prescribe a specific validity period for certification of qualifications and supporting documents. Bidders are, however, encouraged to submit

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
		recently certified documents that are clear and legible for verification purposes
Certification process – scanned and printed copies: Where documents are certified in one location, scanned, printed elsewhere and included in the final submission, must the original certified hard copy be submitted, or will a printed copy of the scanned certified document be accepted?	Bid Returnables / Certification	Certified copies may be submitted. Documents should be legible and capable of verification. Where a certified document was originally certified and subsequently scanned for reproduction, the Department reserves the right to verify authenticity where required.
Non-compulsory briefing: The cover of the bid indicates that the briefing session was non-compulsory, while the generic Rules of Bidding refer to compulsory briefings. Please confirm that non-attendance at this briefing will not render a bid non-responsive.	Bid Cover / Rules of Bidding	It should be noted that non-attendance at this briefing will not render a bid non-responsive.
Envelope labelling: There are different references to the required envelope labelling/format. Which envelope labelling convention or template is authoritative for submission of the bid?	Bid Submission Requirements	The envelope templates contained in the bid pack under Envelope No.1 (Functionality Proposal) and Envelope No.2 (Price Schedule/Financial Proposal) should be used as the authoritative guide for labelling and submission."
The TOR appears to contain overlapping reporting deliverables under Items 2.3.8, 2.3.11 and 2.3.12 relating to monthly,		The Department acknowledges that Items 2.3.8, 2.3.11 and 2.3.12 contain overlapping reporting requirements. These items should

Questions / Comments for Clarification	Reference	Responses
quarterly and annual reporting. Please clarify whether these should be treated as separate deliverables or consolidated reporting requirements for pricing and resource allocation purposes.		not be interpreted as requiring separate reports covering the same information. Bidders should allow for the preparation of monthly, quarterly and annual reports in accordance with the reporting requirements contained in the TOR. The annual diagnostic report referred to in Item 2.3.13 remains a separate deliverable.